



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 150

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, MARCH 26, 2004

No. 40

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, March 29, 2004, at 12:30 p.m.

Senate

FRIDAY, MARCH 26, 2004

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. STEVENS].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Sovereign Lord, You are our strong shelter and hiding place. We praise You for Your love and Your wisdom. You are too wise to ever make a mistake, too loving to ever do anything unkind. When we are unfaithful, eternal God, You remain faithful. Our times are in Your hands.

Thank You that though human beings plan, You have the final word about what happens to our world. Forgive us when we lack the patience to wait for the unfolding of Your powerful providence. Help us to comprehend clearly the road You desire us to travel.

Bless our Senators as they lean upon Your wisdom. Give them the courage to choose the harder right and accomplish those things that will unite rather than divide. Keep them from falling and prepare them to stand before You with great joy.

We pray this in Your powerful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, this morning the Senate will be in a period of morning business to allow Senators to make statements. No rollcall votes will occur today. I do not anticipate a lengthy session of the Senate today. As a reminder, we will begin the welfare reauthorization bill on Monday, and I will be laying out Monday's schedule at the close of today's business. But I would also remind Members that any votes ordered on Monday will be delayed to occur on Tuesday.

OBESITY

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I will be back a little later this morning, but I do want to take an opportunity, seeing our distinguished President pro tempore in the chair today, to comment on an issue I know he feels strongly about as well as I, and that is the issue of physical activity and nutrition and the growing obesity epidemic in the United States.

It is an issue that has, thank goodness, received increasing attention over the last several weeks and months; that is, obesity, the epidemic now in the United States, and its very direct impact on one's overall health, whether it is quality of life or how long one lives.

Despite tremendous gains in public health in this country and, indeed,

around the world, America remains the most overweight country on the globe. Indeed, it is taking its toll in a way that people are only now beginning to realize. But thank goodness they are.

In fact, earlier this year, the CDC, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, released data showing that lack of physical activity and poor nutrition are the second leading causes of death in the United States of America. That is second only to smoking. In fact, if recent trends continue, obesity can soon overtake smoking as the leading cause of death in the United States. Looking at the recent trends, it is very likely that, indeed, will be the case.

The good news about that, and I would also say about smoking—although smoking is such a powerful addiction, it has been shown to be such a challenge—but the good news about the obesity epidemic we are seeing is, through education and a change in lifestyle alone we can prevent this epidemic from occurring. We can prevent this killing.

The trend has been over the last 30 years. It is one of these problems that has been around. We have always had obesity for whole different reasons. But for new reasons—lack of activity, poor nutrition, promotion of poor nutrition—we have had this trend of obesity skyrocketing over a 30-year period. I am very hopeful that by doing our part in the Senate, as elected representatives, as leaders, through the hearing process, through education, through serving as direct examples, we can help turn this tide and again reverse it over the next several years.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S3199

The CDC, the American College of Sports Medicine, and the U.S. Surgeon General have come together to recommend that, for adults, 30 minutes of moderate-intensity activity 5 or more days a week will actually stabilize and reverse the trends we have seen. It is clear that additional physical activity will have even increased benefits on the part of the body that I specialized on, the heart, but also chronic diseases such as diabetes, probably some cancers, clearly lung disease as well. Again, if we can all concentrate on that 30 minutes.

In terms of weight gain, it is not clear yet. We can't accurately predict and say this is how much exercise you need to do to prevent weight gain or reverse weight gain because it is such an individual matter. But we all know physical activity plays a very prominent role in reversing weight gain. It is an important aspect of weight control. It helps promote caloric balance. It helps promote general well-being. In fact, it also helps control appetite.

I mention all this, and I am delighted you will see a lot of Senators and staff members wearing one of these little pedometers. I happen to have one on now. I am a little embarrassed to open up and read how many steps I have taken today. As of 9:30 this morning I have only taken 625 steps. That is too little because by the end of the day I need to have taken a recommended 8,000 or 10,000 steps.

In fact, yesterday I only took about 4,500 steps. So I need to reach my goal of 8,000 to 10,000 over the course of the day. What it does cause me to do is at least think about, instead of taking the elevator right outside the doors, to walk up those two flights of steps, or instead of riding in a car a block or two blocks or three blocks, go ahead and walk on the beautiful day that we have outside. The feedback one gets really helps you think, and then hopefully gives you sort of secondary reinforcement to incorporate that into your lifestyle.

The daily step goals can vary. What I encourage people to do is wear these little inexpensive pedometers. All they do is measure your steps. They do that fairly accurately. People's steps are different lengths, but they give you a way to monitor the activity you do each day, but then also how much you can improve by altering your lifestyle just a little bit. That feedback is very important in terms of changing lifestyle.

During last week—and we will see how long it lasts; I hope it will be for a while—all of my staff have gone out and gotten these little, tiny plastic devices which they are wearing. This week we are going to be measuring our baselines to see where we are, and then we will see in the future how much improvement there is. In fact, later today we will all go out and take a little jog around The Mall. All of us will try bringing our counts up. We try to do a lot within our own Senate community.

I encourage my colleagues to do the same. It is really a matter of raising awareness and changing our lifestyles, which will definitely improve health.

I thank the CDC Foundation and the America on the Move organization for supplying us with these devices. I should also mention for those of my colleagues and others who are listening today who wish to find out more about the pedometers and the importance of daily exercise, two Web sites. The one I highly recommend is the CDC Web site. I will give my colleagues both those addresses. The Web site for America on the Move is www.americaonthemove.org. The Web site for the CDC is www.cdc.gov.

You don't have to run. You can walk. You can use a pedometer doing that, and you can make great strides toward a healthier lifestyle.

A couple of key points:

The 30-minute minimum does not have to be done at one time in terms of the official recommendations. You can do it in three 10-minute intervals over the course of the day. You want to be walking at a fast enough intensity where it will make a difference enough to accelerate the heart rate modestly for each of those 10-minute periods.

Finally, I will close with the best part of all of this, which is that it is never too late. No matter what age you are, you can actually change your overall health status, your quality of life, and how long you live if you decide today to change your lifestyle. It will make a difference. It doesn't matter how old you are, how unfit your baseline is, or how inactive you are. Current research shows that starting a more active lifestyle through exercise can make you healthier and improve your quality of life.

That is my health tip for day. It is a little bit about what we do as physicians, as one who exercises regularly, and as one who believes it can make a difference. I know the distinguished occupant of the Chair, the distinguished President pro tempore, is a religious exerciser.

I wanted to make that very brief statement.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

Who seeks recognition?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

POLITICIZATION OF THE NOMINATION PROCESS

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, our Constitution has vested the Senate with the responsibility of advising and consenting on the President's nominations.

Throughout the full range of administration appointments—from top Cabinet officials, to Federal judges, to boards and commissions—the Senate's role is to speak for the American people and ensure the highest standards of public service are maintained throughout our Government.

We have exercised this oversight authority with extraordinary restraint. Democrats have sought to participate in the nomination process and work together with the administration and the majority in a bipartisan fashion to confirm public servants in the highest traditions of our Nation.

Regrettably, the administration has chosen to reject the course of bipartisanship, even though Democrats have tried to accommodate the President's goal of filling judicial vacancies. The Senate has confirmed a record 173 Federal judges, rejecting only 3.

These three judges were far outside the mainstream and had troubling records of judicial activism in service to extreme ideology. They were rejected for that reason.

In spite of the Senate's judgment, the President has chosen to take the unprecedented step of using recess appointments to bypass the Senate on two occasions. First, in order to appoint Charles Pickering to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. And second, to appoint William Pryor to the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals.

At no point has a President ever used a recess appointment to install a rejected nominee on to the Federal bench. And there are intimations that there will be even more recess appointments in the coming months.

These actions not only poison the nomination process, but they strike at the heart of the principle of checks and balances that is one of the pillars of the American democracy.

This cannot continue. What is at stake here is not just a few nominations. What is at stake is the Senate's obligation to represent the American people and check unrestrained executive power.

This White House is insisting on a radical departure from historic and constitutional practices. They have broken the process and we want to fix it.

And we stand ready to fix it. I have spoken to the majority leader about my serious concerns.

Let us be clear: We will continue to cooperate in the confirmation of Federal judges, but only if the White

House gives us assurances that it will no longer abuse the process and that it will once again respect our Constitution's essential system of checks and balances.

Sadly, this is not the only area in which the administration has chosen to cast aside traditions of bipartisanship and cooperation.

One of the minority's less visible yet vital responsibilities is the naming of Democratic candidates to sit on government boards and commissions.

These boards span the entire range of government responsibilities, from engaging young people in community and national service, to overseeing financial markets, to supervising the security of America's nuclear facilities, to protecting Americans from illegal energy company price-gouging.

They may not get a lot of headlines, but the public servants who sit on these boards perform an extraordinary service to their Nation and have a direct influence on the security, prosperity, health, and well-being of the American people.

Once again, Democrats have tried to work in a bipartisan fashion. In the 108th congress alone, we have confirmed 419 of the President's non-judicial nominations.

Because of the importance of these boards, many have a statutory requirement of bipartisanship. Others have bipartisan participation by long-established practice.

Their purpose is not simply to serve one party or another, or the administration in power at the moment, but the entire Nation. In order to provide our Nation with responsible stewardship, these boards must resist political manipulation and partisan divisions.

For decades, the nomination and confirmation process has honored the unique and vital role of these boards and commissions. During the Clinton administration, for instance, Republican nominations were considered and approved, even when the nominees were outspoken opponents of administration policy.

The same was true during the administrations for Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush.

During the current administration, however, that standard has been cast aside. And a divisive form of political gamesmanship has been allowed to extend to the nomination process. Talented candidates are being prevented from serving their Nation. The views and communities they represent are not being heard. And the American people are losing out as a result.

Among the candidates rejected by the administration are potential nominees to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the Export-Import Bank, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the Corporation for National and Community Service, and many more.

Let me give you a brief background on just a few of these rejected candidates.

For instance, Warren Stern. Early in 2003, Mr. Stern was recommended to serve in the Democratic position on the Defense Nuclear Facilities Board. Shortly afterward, he was rejected on the grounds that he did not have "enough scientific background."

The charge is absurd on its face. Mr. Stern has degrees in physics, nuclear engineering, and national security studies. He was selected as the State Department's Senior coordinator for Nuclear Safety, and he coordinates the work of the Department of Energy and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in the field of international nuclear safety policy.

Last July, while his nomination was supposed to be under consideration at the White House, the State Department conferred upon him the Superior Honor Award, for "developing and implementing a diplomatic and technical strategy for the control of dangerous radioactive materials."

At a time when our intelligence community tells us that America's nuclear facilities are being targeted by terrorists, Mr. Stern brings an extraordinary range and depth of experience that will make America safer. But he is being denied the chance to serve for no reason.

Take Dr. Chon Noriega. Dr. Noriega was nominated in March of 2003 to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting. He was recommended because Democrats believe that Public Broadcasting can do much more to reach out to America's growing Hispanic community.

As the Nation's foremost academic authority on Hispanic media, Dr. Noriega is uniquely suited to help the Corporation for Public Broadcasting achieve this goal. Dr. Noriega is the Associate Director of UCLA's Chicano Studies Research Center and the author of eight books on the topic of Hispanic media.

America's Hispanic community could have no more passionate or effective advocate than Dr. Noriega. Yet the administration has once again refused to nominate a superbly qualified candidate, and the Nation's largest minority community has one less advocate as a result.

Finally, and perhaps most absurdly, is the administration's refusal to nominate Judge Patricia Wald to the Legal Services Corporation. Judge Wald served on the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia for 20 years, the last 5 as its chief judge.

After her retirement from the circuit court, she was asked to serve as a judge on the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia.

Judge Wald is a brilliant jurist, whose probity, integrity, and commitment to the American legal system are unassailable. So respected is she that just last month, President Bush asked her to sit on the commission investigating the collection and use of intelligence leading up to the Iraqi War.

If she can be trusted with the responsibility of restoring confidence in the

intelligence system on which America's security depends, surely she is qualified and trustworthy enough to help extend legal representation to Americans who cannot afford it.

Democrats have tried to work together with the administration to continue the bipartisan process of nominations, both for boards and for the Federal bench.

Repeatedly, we have asked the administration to conduct the nomination process in a bipartisan manner, and we have been denied.

The administration has crossed a line and it is time it pulls back. We can no longer stand by and watch this critical aspect of our responsibilities be undermined by the intrusion of partisan politics.

Whether it is a nomination to a board or a lifetime appointment to the Federal bench, we cannot allow the Senate's role to be disregarded.

Once we have confidence that the integrity of this process is restored, Democrats will be accommodating to the White House's nominations.

We hoped for a different result, but the administration has left us no choice. I ask my Republican colleagues to reach out to administration officials and urge them to return this process to its traditions of bipartisanship and cooperation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The deputy Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Before the Democratic leader leaves the floor, Mr. President, through you to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, is it true we have approved 173 Federal judges during the time President Bush has been President?

Mr. DASCHLE. As of this day, March 26, I answer the Senator from Nevada, we have approved 173 judges and 419 nonjudicial nominations by this administration. I don't know whether the nontraditional nominations is some kind of record over 3 years, but we now know the judicial record of 173 has not been equaled.

So the answer is yes, we have cooperated as fully as any Congress has in accommodating an administration with regard to appointments it considers to be of value to the country. We are only asking for similar consideration of the nominations and a recognition of the importance of the constitutional process of advise and consent, which is why I expressed the concern this morning about the recess appointments of those judges who have not been confirmed in the Senate.

Mr. REID. I also ask, through the Chair to the distinguished Democratic leader, it is also true, is it not, that 173 judges have been approved; we have been, through your direction, very selective and turned down five, two of whom the President has done an unusual thing of making recess appointments. So right now, there are I believe three who have in effect been turned down.

Mr. DASCHLE. The Senator is correct. There have only been 3 out of 173 now that have not been given the authority to serve on the bench and, as I said, for good reason—either their unwillingness to cooperate with the nominating process or fulfill their obligation to provide information regarding their positions, or the fact that they have clearly demonstrated extreme positions on issues that fall way outside the mainstream of philosophical thinking and prevented their confirmation.

The Senator is correct: 173 is the accurate number today.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—and if I am out of line, the Chair in his capacity as the Senator from the State of Alaska can object—to speak for up to 15 minutes in morning business rather than 10.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ATTACKING THE MESSENGER

Mr. REID. Mr. President, when you cannot attack a man's ideas, attack the man. Sadly, that is what we have seen over the last few days in the case of Richard Clarke, a dedicated public servant.

Before this week, few Americans knew who Mr. Clarke was. But now, according to this morning's Washington Post, 9 out of 10 people in America know who Richard Clarke is.

Those who did know Mr. Clarke knew him as a person who has devoted his entire adult life to serving his country and keeping our country safe.

As a distinguished Senator, Bob Kerrey said yesterday—and he knows a thing or two about patriotism—Clarke did many things to keep this country safe, that none of us will ever know about. That is the nature of counterterrorism.

Mr. Clarke has served four Presidents—three Republicans and one Democrat. In fact, he called the first President Bush the best national security professional he had ever worked for. That goes to the very basic knowledge that President Bush, among his other assets, was also head of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mr. Clarke worked in the State Department, and then led the counterterrorism effort in the White House for more than 10 years.

This is how important he was and how much confidence everyone had in his abilities: On the day of the tragedy of September 11, he was put in charge—I repeat, put in charge—of coordinating the White House response. Even today, after he retired from public service, Mr. Clarke continues to make a contribution to our national security.

Mr. Clarke has raised a few questions, important questions, such as: Was fighting terrorism a real priority for the Bush administration prior to September 11, or was it down the list of national security concerns, behind things such as missile defense?

According to an Associated Press story, President Bush's national security team met almost 100 times prior to September 11, but terrorism was the topic of only 2 of these sessions.

The next question: What actions were we taking to knock out Osama bin Laden and his henchmen, who had already successfully attacked several U.S. targets overseas?

Mr. Clarke says President Clinton was obsessed with this.

What were we doing in the first part of 2001, after President Clinton left office and was no longer there, obsessed in some way to get rid of Osama bin Laden? As you know, President Clinton ordered a missile launch in an attempt to get Osama bin Laden.

The next question deals with the Predators, unmanned aerial vehicles. These vehicles were developed 36 miles from Las Vegas in Indian Springs. These vehicles were and are an essential part of the weapons complex that is in Nevada. People do not realize that 40 percent of the airspace of this very large State of Nevada is restricted military airspace. One of the reasons is you can test the Predator, and what it can do and what it cannot do, because of the vast amount of airspace we have in Nevada. So I have a special interest in the Predator because of its basing in Nevada.

Question: Were we following Mr. Clarke's recommendations to utilize this tremendous tool more effectively in the fight against terror?

How much has the war in Iraq helped or hindered our war on terrorism?

Finally, one of the questions Richard Clarke asks: There were at least two of the September 11 hijackers in our country, if terrorism was a top priority, why weren't airport personnel on the lookout for these known terrorists?

These are questions Richard Clarke has asked, reasonable questions.

I refer to today's Washington Post, a front-page story, written by Mike Allen. Among other things, this newspaper article says—similar articles are being run all over America. After Clarke asked these questions, here is what Mike Allen said:

So this week, his aides—

President Bush's aides—

turned the full power of the executive branch on Richard A. Clarke, formerly the administration's top counterterrorism official, who charges in his new book that Bush responded lackadaisically in 2001 to repeated warnings on an impending terrorist attack.

When you cannot attack a man's ideas, or even his questions, you attack the man.

Allen goes on further to say:

They questioned the truthfulness of Clarke's claims, his competence as an employee, the motives behind the book's timing, and even the sincerity of the pleasant-ries in his resignation letter and [his] farewell photo session with Bush.

Just a few others things out of this long article:

James A. Thurber, director of the Center for Congressional and Presidential Studies of

American University, said he was stunned by the ferocity of the White House campaign [against] Clarke.

Thurber goes on also to say:

They are vulnerable, which is why they are attacking so hard. You have to go back to Vietnam or Watergate to get the same feel about the structure of argument coming out of the White House against Clarke's statements.

The article states:

A poll by the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, conducted Monday through Wednesday, found significant public interest in Clarke's criticisms, with nearly nine in 10 . . . Americans surveyed saying they had heard of them [heard of his ideas]. Of those polled, 42 percent said they had heard "a lot" about his claims and 47 percent said they had heard "a little."

Ninety percent of the people in America are aware of what is going on with these ferocious attacks.

Are these legitimate questions? Is it a legitimate question to find out why the national security team met 100 times and only twice discussed terrorism? It is a legitimate question. It deserves a legitimate answer.

President Clinton was obsessed with taking out Osama bin Laden. Why wasn't the President of the United States, George W. Bush, obsessed with taking out Osama bin Laden? It is a valid question.

Why wasn't the Predator aircraft used to find and destroy Osama bin Laden and his operations? It is a question Richard Clarke raises. It deserves an answer.

Another question he raises—and America understands this; the people in Nevada understand this—how much has the war in Iraq helped or hindered the war on terrorism? That is a question that is running through the fiber of the American people.

Finally, Richard Clarke asks:

Why weren't we doing something to get rid of the terrorists who we already knew were here?

These are legitimate questions. I think there could be legitimate differences about the answers to these questions. We should be debating these issues and not whether Clarke's meeting with the President, when he left, was sincere, or attacking him personally about his not being a good employee. I do not think that is the right way to answer these questions.

When you cannot attack a man's ideas, you attack the man. That is wrong.

The questions that have been raised are legitimate, and they deserve answers. We should be debating these issues in a way that reflects the gravity and the seriousness of this challenge to our Nation. There is not a single one of these questions that has been asked that is not serious.

I think it is sad that, based on what we have seen in the past from this administration—I guess I should not be surprised. Any time this administration is faced with tough questions they do not want to answer, they respond by making personal attacks.

Here on the floor yesterday I talked about what they have tried to do to demonize and damage Senator TOM DASCHLE. He is the leader of the Democratic Senate. He has been the titular head of the Democratic Party, and there have been very personal attacks directed toward him, questioning his patriotism—a man who served in the U.S. military—attacking his family, attacking his religiosity—whether he is a proper member of his church. These are not proper responses.

Senator DASCHLE, as he did today, came to the floor and said he does not believe the White House is handling the nominations of statutory Democratic nominations; they are rejecting them, and they are rejecting them for no cause.

Why doesn't someone come and defend that, say we are rejecting all these 36 people because they are all bad people and not qualified? No, they are not willing to do that. They go after Senator DASCHLE. They did it to former Senator Max Cleland, one of the most courageous, inspirational, wonderful people I have ever met in my life.

Senator Cleland went to Vietnam, volunteered to go, a strapping man, 6 foot 4. You would never know it now because you never see him stand. He only has one leg. He has no arms. I am sorry. He has no legs, and he has one arm. For him to get dressed every morning is a 2-hour ordeal. A man with always a smile on his face, a man who, prior to his serious injury, was honored with the Silver Star in Vietnam for his gallantry. But that was not enough.

He was attacked personally for not being patriotic because he did not support the President's version of homeland security. With untold amounts of money, he was defeated in his reelection bid in Georgia.

He was the original cosponsor of the bill to create a Department of Homeland Security, long before President Bush supported such an idea. But this was not good enough. They attacked him, not his ideas.

When the President finally came around and agreed we needed a Department of Homeland Security, Mr. Cleland did not agree with him on all the details about how the employees should be classified. Fair enough. Debate the issues and discuss your differences. But this administration condoned campaign TV ads that compared Max Cleland, who lost three limbs, to Osama bin Laden and Saddam Hussein. Can you imagine that?

ZELL MILLER, my friend—I care a great deal about him—doesn't vote with us a lot on issues. He is a Democrat and has been his whole life. He doesn't vote with the Democrats as I think he should, but I respect his voting in a way that he believes is appropriate for his conscience. But ZELL MILLER, being the patriot he is and knowing the sacrifices Max Cleland has made for his country, said:

My friend Max deserves better than to be slandered like this.

Congratulations to ZELL MILLER. I have read his book, his second book. He has written one on the Marine Corps I have not read. I congratulate him. I have great respect for my friend ZELL MILLER. I appreciate very much his stepping out, doing his very best to protect and defend his friend Max Cleland. Every Member of the Senate agrees on this side of the aisle with what ZELL did.

Senator Cleland was not the only person. I talked about Senator DASCHLE. If you want to read an interesting book, read Paul O'Neill's "The Price of Loyalty." Paul O'Neill is one of America's great businessmen. He was chief executive officer of Alcoa Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAFEE). The Senator has used 15 minutes.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent to speak for another 7½ minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. No one would ever question his business acumen and his Republican Party credentials. He, as Secretary of the Treasury, didn't think the President conducted his office appropriately. He was asked to resign and left and wrote a book about his experiences in the White House as Secretary of the Treasury. Rather than trying to factually discount his book statements, they went after him. He questioned economic policies, foreign policy issues, and was denounced as a person who did not know what he was talking about or doing. It is a lot easier to attack a man personally than it is to defend the economic policies that have controlled our country. It is a lot easier to attack a man personally than it is to defend the economic policies that have contributed to the largest deficit in history, the worst record in jobs since Herbert Hoover. It is easier, but that doesn't mean it is right.

It wasn't right to leak the name of an undercover CIA agent because her husband said the President was mistaken about claiming Iraq had purchased uranium from Africa. Can you imagine that? An undercover CIA operative, someone who could be subject to be killed. Not only could that woman be subject to be harmed, but what about all the contacts she had. She was an undercover spy for America, and the White House, in an effort to disparage this man who disagreed with the administration on whether there was uranium that had come to Iraq from Africa, rather than questioning whether that was a fact, went after his wife.

It wasn't right to compare Senator Cleland to a murderer like Osama bin Laden, to attack Senator DASCHLE. These kinds of personal attacks are known as *ad hominem* arguments. That is Latin for "to the man." As a logical term, it means instead of refuting the point or argument being presented, you attack the person presenting it. In short, if you don't like the message, attack the messenger. Aristotle called *ad*

hominem arguments a fallacy of logic. They are the last recourse of those who can't debate an issue on its merits. The purpose of an *ad hominem* attack is to either convince your opponent to stop arguing or to convince the audience to stop listening. Sometimes it works, but it hasn't worked here. Nine out of every 10 Americans know of Richard Clarke's story. I don't think Richard Clarke is going to be intimidated.

I don't know him. To my knowledge, I have never spoken to him. I think the American people want an honest discussion of the questions this patriot is raising. This administration is attacking its critics. They are firing them, such as Larry Lindsey, or threatening to fire them, such as Mr. Foster, for telling the truth.

Larry Lindsey tried to tell the truth about how much the war was going to cost. He said it would cost \$100 billion. He got fired. But he was way short. Last year alone we appropriated over \$150 billion. General Shinseki, when he told the truth about how many troops we would need, got fired. It is a matter of record. Foster wanted last year to tell us how much Medicare would cost. He was told if he said a word, he would be fired, if he told the truth about the cost of Medicare.

This administration does not take questions well. It is too bad. In America we have a right to ask questions about what our Government is doing. Those questions deserve honest answers and debate, not threats and personal attacks.

I thank my colleagues. I am sorry they had to wait. I usually try not to speak very long. No one was here when I started. I certainly apologize for using more than my 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to speak for 15 minutes, and I may yield some time back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MISSTATEMENTS ABOUT THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, allow me to respond to some of the comments we have heard this morning, both from the minority leader and the minority whip. While it has been a rather broad attack on the administration on a number of different fronts, there are a couple of things I would like to direct my comments to by way of response.

I only wish that when we had differences of policy, we would confine our disagreements to policy and not make egregious errors of fact. While everybody has a right to their opinion, no one has a right to be wrong about the facts, or to misstate them in such a patently inaccurate way. My intention is to try to correct some of these misstatements that have been made by the minority leader, as well as the minority whip.

Really, they relate to two different areas. As I said, the attack has been rather broad and varied, but I have chosen to talk about the issue of nominations and the minority whip's comments with regard to Mr. Richard Clarke.

Let me first talk about Mr. Richard Clarke. I had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Clarke several years ago when I was attorney general of the State of Texas. We had him come down to the State and consult with us on the issue of cyber-terrorism, an area that most people in this country probably haven't thought a lot about but which is very important to our national security. Indeed, Mr. Clarke brought with him tremendous credentials in terms of his experience in counterterrorism working, as he did, during the Clinton administration, and then for a while under the administration of President George W. Bush.

Mr. President, I think it is blatantly unfair of Mr. Clarke, notwithstanding his credentials in counterterrorism, which I admire, to suggest that this President who was in office roughly 8 months before the attacks of September 11 was responsible for the 9/11 incident, when in fact the administration of President Bill Clinton, in which Mr. Clark worked, stood by and did not respond adequately to ever-escalating attacks against this country by Osama bin Laden and by al-Qaida.

It was in 1993 that Osama bin Laden directed al-Qaida's first successful attack on American soil, blowing up a car bomb in the basement garage of the World Trade Center, killing 6 and wounding 1,000. And then, in 1996, there was another attack against the United States Air Force's Khobar Towers barracks in Saudi Arabia, killing 19 Americans and wounding 515 Americans and Saudis. Then, in 1998, U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania were attacked by al-Qaida suicide bombers who killed 234 people and wounded more than 5,000. And then, in 2000, al-Qaida attacked USS *Cole*, killing 17 American sailors and wounding 39.

Mr. President, I think it is only fair to ask where Mr. Clarke was during these ever-escalating attacks by al-Qaida and Osama bin Laden against Americans. The truth is, he was working in the Clinton White House in counterterrorism. I am confident he was doing everything he thought he could do. But if you have read some of his remarks, apparently he felt he was not getting a good response out of the President and others; indeed, he was prevented from briefing President Clinton on some of these attacks. The Director of the Central Intelligence Agency himself was not allowed to give daily briefings to President Clinton, as he currently does and as he has done since the beginning of the Bush administration.

So I would say Mr. Clarke's motives for making these reckless allegations against President Bush and the Bush administration just don't ring true. In-

deed, perhaps they are a diversion from his responsibility and the responsibility of the previous administration when it came to never adequately responding to Osama bin Laden and al-Qaida attacks until, of course, the terrible day of September 11.

Indeed, if you listen to some of President Bush's critics and the comments made by the minority whip and others on this very floor and in the press, you would say they are complaining that the President didn't do enough when it comes to fighting the war on terror. Of course, just a few short days ago, before Mr. Clarke's book came out, these same critics were saying the President had done too much, and that his policy and the Nation's policy of preemptive attack against our enemies—that is, not waiting until we are attacked and more Americans are killed, but going after the sleeper cells and the terrorists where they live before they can attack and thus protecting American citizens and American property in that way.

So really I don't see how they can have it both ways. By saying on one hand, if you believe Mr. Clarke, the administration didn't do enough, but then if you listen to other critics, just a few short days ago they were saying this President, this administration, did too much—you cannot have it both ways. I think the American people understand that. They also understand what is happening in the Senate and elsewhere, when this administration is attacked for leading the war on terror.

The truth is—and I think the American people recognize this—that no one has demonstrated greater leadership and greater commitment to protecting Americans and America's national interests on the war on terror than President George W. Bush—no one. The American people know that. It is just not right to try to suggest otherwise. It certainly contradicts those assertions and contradicts all of the facts I have only spoken about. If necessary, we can revisit this at a later time.

I also want to respond to some of the comments made by the minority leader about the nominations process and his claim that Democrats have extended an open hand of bipartisanship in an attempt to confirm nominees to various boards and commissions and to the Federal bench.

The truth is, again, Mr. President, we are all entitled to our opinions and our policy differences. Indeed, I think the American people expect us to fight on this floor, rhetorically speaking, for those positions we believe in and which we believe are in the best interest of the American people. What they should also expect is that we would not come here and make such inaccurate statements of fact about this supposed bipartisanship when it comes to our Democratic colleagues on the nominations issue.

I have the honor of serving on the Senate Judiciary Committee, where we have seen unprecedented obstruction of

President Bush's judicial nominees. Indeed, never before in the history of the United States of America have a handful of Democrats—handful of any party—been able to successfully block a bipartisan majority from confirming President Bush's highly qualified judicial nominees.

I heard the minority leader talk about a highly qualified Hispanic nominee who he believes should be confirmed to a position. I was reminded of the terrible treatment that Miguel Estrada received at the hands of this same leadership on the Democratic side.

This immigrant from Honduras came to the United States when he was 17 years old. He could barely speak English. He taught himself the English language, went on to graduate from two of America's most prestigious institutions of higher learning, and went on to rise to the top of the legal profession. He represented the U.S. Government in 15 arguments before the United States Supreme Court. Arguing a case before the United States Supreme Court is the Super Bowl when it comes to the legal profession.

Notwithstanding the fact that Miguel Estrada was a highly qualified, very successful appellate lawyer, someone enormously qualified to serve on the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, he was denied the courtesy of an up-or-down vote. No one suggests that any Senator who thinks they should vote against a nominee should not do so.

Certainly, we should all vote our own conscience, and we will be held accountable by the voters at the next election, but what has happened is a bipartisan majority was simply obstructed by the gamesmanship and the unprecedented way in which this President's judicial nominees have been treated, such as Miguel Estrada, who represents the manifestation of the American dream.

Miguel Estrada's dream came to a crashing halt when he hit the glass ceiling imposed by the Democratic minority in the Senate. There is no nice way to put it. It is ugly, it is partisan, and it is unworthy of the Members of this body and those of us who are sworn to protect the public interest rather than special interests.

While sitting in my office listening, I was also astonished to hear the minority leader talk about the President's use of recess appointments when it comes to Charles Pickering, whom he appointed to serve on the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, and Bill Pryor, who was appointed during a recess by the President to the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals. What they did not tell the American people is, the only reason the President had to use the power that is very clearly conferred upon him in the U.S. Constitution is because of this unprecedented obstruction by the Democratic minority in the Senate, which denied these two highly qualified nominees, Charles Pickering,

now Judge Pickering of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, and Judge Bill Pryor, an up-or-down vote.

The only reason they resorted again to this unprecedented obstruction, denying them even the courtesy of an up-or-down vote, is because they knew if allowed to vote, a bipartisan majority of the Senate would confirm those appointments.

Here again, we are entitled to have policy differences and, indeed, we will, but the suggestion that somehow President Bush used these recess appointments in some sort of unauthorized or inappropriate way is false. The fact is, during the course of this country's history, recess appointment power has been used more than 300 times. To suggest that President Bush has somehow gone outside the power conferred upon him under the U.S. Constitution is not true.

Sometimes I am amazed that people can say things with a straight face. I expect them to wink or otherwise indicate they know they are trying to pull a fast one, but the fact is the suggestion, the inference that those speakers would ask the American people to draw from their comments are just not true.

President Clinton used recess appointments. Frequently, former Presidents used recess appointments of one kind or another when they were not able to get their nominees confirmed on the timetable they wanted for whatever reason, but that is a power clearly conferred upon the President under the U.S. Constitution.

Can I ask how much time I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used his 15 minutes.

Mr. CORNYN. I ask unanimous consent for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Thank you. I thank my colleague from Minnesota for his courtesy.

Finally, I will say that serving on the Judiciary Committee has been a startling experience for this Senator, a new member of the Senate coming, as I did, to this body expecting that all Senators would want to try to work through our differences in a way that reaches consensus and in a way that allows us to do our job.

Unfortunately, the Judiciary Committee has spiraled down into partisan dysfunction in a way that is, frankly, not very pleasant, and it is not doing the best job we can and should be doing for the American people.

The truth is, what we see happening is a handful of special interest groups that seem to be calling the tune, and Senators, unfortunately, responding to that and blocking President Bush's nominees. We saw during the revelation of a number of memos that came to light that, indeed, some of these interest groups were trying to manipulate the outcome in lawsuits that were pending on the court of appeals.

One very sensitive case affecting our entire Nation was an affirmative ac-

tion case. That case involved the University of Michigan's affirmative action policies. The memos reveal that nominees were being blocked and slowpeddled in an effort to have an impact on that litigation. It is not right.

Now I know my colleagues, all of us on the Judiciary Committee, have decried the way in which some of these memos came to light. The truth is, an overzealous, misguided staffer accessed computer files of both Republican and Democrat members of the Senate Judiciary Committee and released those publicly. We have had the Sergeant at Arms conduct an investigation. Indeed, a number of us have asked the appropriate prosecutor to investigate it to see if criminal charges should be brought concerning the way in which these memos came to light. But just as the Pentagon Papers, years ago, were accessed unlawfully, they demonstrate a very real public policy concern that I do not think we can ignore.

There are two things that have happened. One is the taking of the memos, and the other is the inappropriateness the conduct revealed.

As I close my remarks, I again thank my colleague from Minnesota for his courtesy by allowing me to speak first.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed 20 minutes to make my remarks. I do not believe I will need all that time, but I would ask to have that available.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, I say to my good friend from Texas, with whom I shared a very instructive tour of Iraq last July—we sweltered together in 115 degrees—I have the greatest regard for him in working with him on these various matters. I do respectfully say in response to his comment about the 9/11 questions that have been raised, and supposedly my colleagues wanting to have things both ways, his words, I cannot for the life of me figure out how he and others on that side of the aisle could suggest that President Clinton is to blame for something that occurred over 8½ months after he left office, but President Bush is not to blame for something that happened 8½ months after he took office and is not blamed for anything related to it since. I don't understand how that is anything other than trying to have it both ways and also not making much sense at all.

I think both of us would be well served to let the Commission make its determinations and recognize that our most important task is to make sure it never happens again. We share that desire here, for all 100 of us are Americans first and partisans second or third or somewhere else. Let's hope the truth all comes forth so that, most impor-

tantly, we can understand what we need to do to make sure this country is safe every day and night for the rest of my lifetime and yours and all the rest of our children to follow.

I want to shift to another subject. Yesterday's Washington Post had an article about the famous magician, Henry Houdini, and the dispute whether or not his magic tricks should be disclosed to the public. It made me think, as I was looking back on the events that occurred in the Senate this last week, that we have our own magic tricks. One of them is this disappearing legislation trick. Unfortunately, it is one of too many, too clever sleight of hand tricks that are employed in this body. I think, in fact, we need more of a return to reality if we are going to serve the vital interests of the people I represent in Minnesota, and others around the country.

At the start of the week, for those who may not have been following this moment by moment, we were considering a bill that was entitled a JOBS Act. If ever there was a situation facing America and the over 8 million Americans who do not have jobs right now that needs a serious dose of reality, that is at the top of the list. Senator TOM HARKIN, my colleague from Iowa, was offering an amendment that would either have this body choose to support or oppose the Department of Labor's taking overtime pay, the 1½ times an hourly pay required for those working overtime. In this case, this group would be over 8 million Americans workers—police officers, other law enforcement officials, firefighters, teachers, middle-class working Americans. These are hard-working Americans working overtime to earn extra money to improve their lives or just to try to make ends meet; to raise their families, send their kids to college, or just get them through junior high school; take care of an aging or sick parent, help pay for the prescription drugs for those elderly parents or nursing homes for them, which costs about the same these days.

We had an agreement reached before the bill came to the floor between the Republican and Democratic leaders that there would be a vote on the Harkin amendment. That was the promise that was made to all of us. But suddenly here was this Senate's disappearing act, this sleight-of-hand trick that even the famous Harry Houdini could not have matched. That bill just disappeared from the Senate floor and was replaced by another bill which was voted upon and passed last night.

Monday, now, we are told we will be taking up another bill but not the JOBS Act. Where did it go? When will it come back? Will it come back at all? Actually, that pretty well describes the Republican job record under President Bush. Millions of jobs disappear. No one knows when they are coming back. No one knows if they are coming back. Secretary of Treasury John Snow, testifying before a congressional committee just 2 weeks ago, said the lack

of job recovery in this country was "a mystery."

Vice President CHENEY doesn't even seem to know the jobs are leaving. He said earlier this month:

If the Democratic policies had been pursued over the last 2 or 3 years, we would have not had the kind of job growth we have had.

At the time he offered that compelling insight, the country officially had 2¼ million fewer jobs than when he and President Bush took office just over 3 years ago. So I would have to agree with the Vice President on that point; if the Democratic policies had been pursued over the last 2 or 3 years, we would not have had the kind of job growth we have had. Perhaps he was confused and was referring to the kind of job growth Halliburton has had instead of the United States.

The Vice President, by the way, has shown his own disappearing magic tricks. Just before he became Vice President, in the 5 years preceding that time, he was the chief executive officer of Halliburton Corporation, which is the world's largest oil and gas services company. It is also now the largest contractor for American forces in Iraq having received contracts worth over \$11 billion in the last year, most of them without any competitive bidding.

Vice President CHENEY reported earnings of \$44 million during his 5 years there. He claims he has "severed all my ties" with that company. Yet he continues to receive deferred compensation worth approximately \$150,000 a year, and he has stock options worth more than \$18 million. That is the executive version of overtime pay. He gets paid for hours he hasn't worked after he has left the company.

The Vice President has announced he will donate the proceeds from his sale of the stock options at some point in the future to charity, and that is a good disappearing taxes trick because that charitable deduction eliminates taxes on that amount of future income, \$18 million, which is presumably why he is waiting to give that money to deserving charities until he can make even more of that money again.

But the even more curious magic trick, according to an article in *New Yorker* magazine by Jane Mayer last month, on the Vice President's own official biography posted on his White House Web site, he has been a "businessman," but any mention of his 5 years as chief executive officer of Halliburton Corporation just before he became Vice President has disappeared. He got paid over \$44 million, he has over \$18 million more still to come, and it is not even worth mentioning? I guess that is what "severing all my ties with the company" means with the Vice President. He keeps getting paid but stops mentioning it.

President Bush has his own missing jobs magic tricks. He tries to make more jobs appear than really exist. Last month, he released a report called the Economic Report of the President. It forecast 900,000 more jobs for that

month than actually existed. That slight discrepancy was perhaps while the Secretary of Labor, Elaine Chao, whose agency publishes the Economic Report of the President, tried to make President Bush's signature on the report disappear. She said 3 weeks ago, after the report was made public: "He doesn't sign the report."

She is going to have to make a lot of page 4's disappear where the signature, "George W. Bush," or some version of that name, certainly looks to exist. But maybe the signature, like the 900,000 jobs, are just illusions.

Secretary Chao, who has done some very good things on behalf of Minnesota, for which I am very grateful to her, was also reportedly one of the people who wanted the Senate's vote on the Harkin amendment to disappear. After all, it is her rule, by administrative fiat, that is the one revoking those overtime protections for 8 million of her fellow Americans.

There is no magic in that trick, for those are real Americans and their families. It is a mean trick. It is an unfair trick. It is being performed by one unelected Cabinet official, although I suspect there are some elected officials behind her. And we, the elected representatives of those 8 million Americans, are told we will not be allowed to vote on that matter. Who claims to have that right to tell us that we can't vote, after we have been promised that we would have that opportunity to do so? Whoever it is may have the power under Senate rules, but they don't have the right. And they are wrong to do it.

Meanwhile, the President is out looking, himself, for those 900,000 missing jobs that weren't there. Last month, at a carefully staged and scripted meeting with some business owners that was designed to show how the President's big tax cuts for the rich and super rich, which the majority of colleagues here passed—how they are fueling economic recovery and job creation across America, one business owner proudly disclosed that as a result of the President's tax cuts worth an undisclosed amount of money to him personally, he might be able to hire two or three people.

The President, according to the report, seized that comment like a drowning man grabbing a floating leaf. The President said:

When he [the businessman] says he's going to hire two more, that's really good news. A lot of people are feeling confident and optimistic about our future, so they can say I am going to hire two more.

They can sit here and tell the President in front of all the cameras, I am going to hire two more people. That is confidence. That is pretty confident, inspiring stuff, isn't it? Of course, the President has an undergraduate degree from Yale and an MBA from Harvard, and presumably knows math himself. But I will still point out it takes a lot more than a business owner feeling optimistic about hiring two people to make his job forecast for the last

month reality. At two jobs per televised Presidential meeting—bear with me, I only have one Yale undergraduate degree, but it was cum laude—it will take 450,000 televised Presidential meetings to make up for the missing 900,000 jobs. That is the last month. That is only part of the over 2¼ million jobs that have disappeared since the President started his job in January of 2001, which partly explains why he is applying for 4 more years of overtime. It also explains why, in the view of this American, he should not get it.

This part of the act is a little confusing, even for a magic show. Bear with me and follow closely. For all of those lost jobs in our economy, we are not yet able to bring them back. Yet the Senate JOBS bill disappeared without being voted on. So the American people should be concerned. Right? The answer is no, because it is really not a jobs bill. It is called a "jobs" bill, but it is not really about creating jobs. It is about giving tax breaks to the corporations—\$114 billion worth of tax breaks which they might or might not use to create jobs which might or might not be in the United States. It was given the title of the JOBS Act even though it was primarily not about restoring those missing American jobs.

In fact, it was given that title probably because it is not a jobs bill, but its sponsors wanted the American people to believe it is a jobs bill. They will think, Wow, that is a good Congress. They just passed a JOBS Act, although we didn't pass the JOBS Act. It disappeared. But not to worry, because again it won't do that much to add jobs, anyway—at least not the way it is drafted.

How is that for a sleight-of-hand trick? Masters of illusion right here in Washington. Houdini and David Copperfield would have to be amazed.

But, unfortunately, all this hocus-pocus—now you see it, now you don't—leads us to believe one thing, but it is really something else. All of those deceptions do not deal with reality. As my colleagues know, each lost job is some American's very real nightmare. Being unemployed for so long they are using up their unemployment compensation, have little or no income and still can't find a decent job is no illusion.

The average length of time for America's 8 million unemployed citizens who have been out of work is now the longest in 20 years. The number of manufacturing jobs and good, decent-paying jobs in this country is the lowest in 53 years.

That is real. The hardships, the pain and suffering of those lost jobs have caused the real Americans, good people in Minnesota—and I am quite sure everywhere else in this country—people who want to work, who do not want a handout, who want jobs. They want the chance to work and earn their American dreams, and to work overtime and get paid for it.

By the way, our colleagues should recall that overtime—the 1½ times or more requirement of additional pay for those additional hours worked—provides an incentive for expanding companies, to add new jobs, to replace old ones they have taken away, rather than paying the 1½ times for that additional work they need. Employers have a choice. They can choose to pay overtime instead of adding additional jobs. Overtime is good pay for those workers who want to earn more money. It is good for the economy because those additional dollars they earn are almost always going immediately right into spending for needed products and services. But it is also a good inducement for creation of new jobs to increase production.

But even my Republican colleagues and evidently the Bush administration don't want us to even have a vote on this amendment on what they are calling a JOBS bill. They are also complaining to my colleagues and me on this side of the aisle that we want to offer some other amendments to change this bill. Yes, we do. They say our amendments are not germane. That is legislative language for not being relevant, not related to the content of the bill we are considering. Overtime pay is certainly relevant to the people in Minnesota I represent—police officers, firefighters, laborers, and nurses.

Another amendment which Republicans say is not germane would extend unemployment benefits. During the last 2 months alone 760,000 Americans have exhausted their unemployment benefits. That is no illusion. That is real-life hardship and pain for real Americans and for their families.

I think the sponsors of this so-called JOBS Act should explain to those 760,000 of their fellow citizens why restoring their unemployment benefits is not germane or is not relevant to their bill. I think those 760,000 Americans would then see clearly this so-called JOBS Act is not relevant to jobs—not to their jobs, not to restoring jobs, not to replacing jobs, not to preventing more jobs from being sent overseas.

In fact, one of my amendments, which I think is highly germane, would eliminate the \$36 billion for tax breaks for U.S. corporations for their overseas operations. Why in the world would we want to provide more tax incentives for U.S. corporations to create more jobs in other countries? We can't prevent it, but we certainly shouldn't encourage it. We shouldn't use more American tax incentives to put more Americans out of work and add to budget deficits their children will have to pay for, if they are lucky enough to have jobs.

My amendment would eliminate that lunacy. It will demand every dollar in this \$114 billion of corporate tax cuts be justified according to one clear measure: How will it result in more jobs, new jobs, and restore jobs in the United States for our citizens now? Not maybe, not probably, not next month, but definitely and provably and now.

That is the kind of JOBS Act America needs. That is the JOBS Act Americans need, and they need it done now. People losing overtime need this bill now. People who have lost their unemployment benefits need this bill now. People who are losing jobs still at this time in America overseas need this bill now—not the JOBS bill, but the one we want to amend to make a real jobs bill for America.

I am for the majority leader bringing this bill back to the floor next Monday. We are scheduled to bring up welfare reform. That is an important subject. But the experts would tell me the No. 1 key to the successful welfare program is a job at the end of the program.

Let us bring the JOBS Act, so-called, back first and scrutinize every single dollar it proposes to spend for its job effect for Americans now. No more magic tricks. This is the time for honest, truthful reality. Let us get to work starting next Monday in the Senate putting America back to work—all Americans. That would be real bipartisanship.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRIST. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OUTRAGEOUS CHARGES BY RICHARD CLARKE

Mr. FRIST. Madam President, in about 30 minutes or so, we will be closing. Before doing that, I want to spend a few minutes talking about an occurrence and a series of events over the course of the past week stemming from comments and testimony by a former State Department civil servant named Richard Clarke.

In a book that is scheduled to be released for sale by the parent company of the CBS network, Mr. Clarke makes the outrageous charge that the Bush administration, in its first 7 months in office, failed to adequately address the threat of Osama bin Laden. There has been a fulminating in the media and by some Senators about this book. I want to take this opportunity to reflect a bit on this, because I am deeply disturbed by the charges that have been made by Mr. Clarke. I am disturbed, in part, by the way it has been handled by some of our colleagues and by the media itself.

I am troubled by the charges. I am equally troubled someone would sell a book that trades on their former service as a Government insider with access to classified information, our Nation's most valuable intelligence, in order to profit from the suffering surrounding what this Nation endured on September 11, 2001.

I am troubled that Senators on the other side of the aisle are so quick to

accept such claims. I am troubled that Mr. Clarke has had a hard time keeping his own story straight. I don't personally know Mr. Clarke—I have met him—although I take it from press accounts that he has been involved in the fight against terrorism for the past decade.

As 9/11 demonstrates, that decade was a period of growing peril, a period of unanswered attacks against the United States. It is self-serving, I believe, that Mr. Clarke asserts that the United States could have stopped terrorism if only the three Presidents he served had listened to Mr. Clarke. In fact, when Mr. Clarke was at the height of his influence as the terrorism czar for President Clinton, the United States saw the first attack on the World Trade Center, saw the attack on the U.S. Air Force barracks in Saudi Arabia, the attacks on the two U.S. embassies in Africa, the attack on the USS *Cole*, and the planning and implementation for the 9/11 attacks.

The only common denominator throughout those 10 years of unanswered attacks was Mr. Clarke himself, a consideration that is clearly driving his effort to point fingers and to shift blame. He was the only common denominator throughout that period.

This pointing fingers, this shifting blame I will come back to because if we look at all the data and all the evidence, it becomes the common theme.

While the reasons may be open to debate and discussion, the previous administration's response to these repeated attacks by al-Qaida was clearly inadequate—a few cruise missiles lobbed at some, at best, questionable targets. Al-Qaida could only have been encouraged by their record of success in the absence of a serious and a sustained response by the United States during that period.

After 10 years of policies that failed to decisively confront and to eliminate that threat from al-Qaida, Clarke now suggests that those first 7 months of the Bush administration is where the blame should lie. Again, after 10 years of attack after attack with an inadequate response, with Mr. Clarke being the common denominator, to put the blame almost entirely on the first 7 months of the Bush administration to me is shifting blame and finger-pointing.

What is interesting is that what we heard this week has not always been Mr. Clarke's view of the events leading up to September 11. This week, a transcript was released of a press interview that Mr. Clarke gave in August of 2002, not that long ago. I will submit for the RECORD the full transcript, but I do want to cite a portion of this interview reviewing in glowing terms the policies of the Bush administration in fighting terrorism. I will be quoting exactly from the interview:

Richard Clarke:

Actually, I've got about seven points. Let me just go through them quickly.

Again, these are Mr. Clarke's words:

The first point, I think the overall point is, there was no plan on Al Qaeda that was passed from the Clinton administration to the Bush administration.

No plan.

Mr. Clarke's words:

Second point is that the Clinton administration had a strategy in place, effectively dating from 1998. And there were a number of issues on the table since 1998. And they remained on the table when that administration went out of office—issues like aiding the Northern Alliance in Afghanistan, changing our Pakistan policy, changing our policy towards Uzbekistan. And in January 2001, the incoming Bush administration was briefed on the existing strategy. They were also briefed on these series of issues that had not been decided on in a couple of years.

Mr. Clarke continues, using his exact words:

And the third point is the Bush administration decided then, you know, mid-January, to do two things. One, vigorously pursue the existing policy, including all of the lethal covert action findings, which we've now made public to some extent.

And the point is, while this big review was going on, there were still in effect, the lethal findings were still in effect. The second thing the administration decided to do is to initiate a process to look at those issues which had been on the table for a couple of years and get them decided.

So, point five, that process which was initiated in the first week in February, decided in principle, in the spring to add to the existing Clinton strategy and to increase CIA resources, for example, for covert action, five-fold, to go after Al Qaeda.

The sixth point, the newly-appointed deputies—and you had to remember, the deputies didn't get into office until late March, early April. The deputies then tasked the development of the implementation details of these new decisions that they were endorsing, and sending out to the principals.

I am still reading verbatim through the interview. His words:

Over the course of the summer—last point—they developed implementation details, the principals met at the end of the summer, approved them in their first meeting, changed the strategy by authorizing the increase in funding five-fold, changing the policy on Pakistan, changing the policy on Uzbekistan, changing the policy on the Northern Alliance assistance.

And then changed the strategy from one of rollback with Al Qaeda over the course [of] five years, which it had been, to a new strategy that called for the rapid elimination of Al Qaeda. This is in fact the time line.

Those are the words of Richard Clarke during a series of questions I will make a part of the RECORD. I will take the final question, in the interest of time, to Mr. Clarke. Question:

You're saying that the Bush administration did not stop anything that the Clinton administration was doing while it was making the decisions, and by the end of the summer had increased money for covert action five-fold. Is that correct?

Mr. Clarke's answer:

All of that's correct.

Madam President, I went through the interview in detail like that because you can see clearly how out of sync it is. It is almost just the opposite of what he said this week, and it is important for us to understand, if we are going to look at Mr. Clarke's credi-

bility, this juxtaposition, this contrast, how dissimilar to what comes out of his mouth it actually is.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. FRIST. This is not the only account in which Mr. Clarke changes his story. In lengthy testimony before the congressional joint inquiry that reviewed the events surrounding the September 11 attacks, Mr. Clarke is equally effusive in his praise for his actions of the Bush administration. It is my hope we will be able to get that testimony declassified. That request has been made so all Senators may review it and discuss it as well. But it is effusive praise under oath.

I do not know what Mr. Clarke's motive is. I have no earthly idea what his motive for these charges is. Is it personal gain? Is it partisan gain? Is it in some way personal profit? Is it animus because of his failure to win a promotion with the Bush administration? I just do not know. None of us is going to ever know. But one thing is clear, and that is his motive could not possibly be to bring clarity or true understanding of how we avoid future September 11 attacks.

There are five points I would like to make, five points that I find absolutely inexplicable about Mr. Clarke's performance this past week. I have waited to come to the floor until the end of the week because I couldn't really believe what Mr. Clarke was saying, based on what we know of his past performance and his participation in the former administration. I wanted to have time, and I will make these five points in a quick fashion.

Point No. 1: In an e-mail to the National Security Adviser 4 days after the September 11 attacks, Mr. Clarke expressed alarm that "when the era of national unity begins to crack" an effort to assign responsibility for the 9/11 attacks will begin.

Mr. Clarke, in the e-mail, then proceeds to lay out in detail a defense of his own personal actions before the attack and those of the entire administration, all of that spelled out in the e-mail.

Mr. Clarke clearly, when we look at his e-mail, was consumed by the desire to dodge any blame for the 9/11 attacks; while at the very same moment rescuers were still searching the rubble at the site of the World Trade Center looking for survivors, he was looking for some way to dodge blame for himself. In my mind, this offers some insight, maybe even perfect insight, as to what drove him to write his book.

The second point, in August 2002, the interview I read, Mr. Clarke gave a thorough account of the Bush administration's very proactive policy against al-Qaida. When presented with that interview, Mr. Clarke tries to explain

away that media performance, the interview itself, by suggesting, well, I just gave the interview in that way as a loyal servant to the administration.

A loyal administration official? Does Mr. Clarke understand the gravity of the issues this body, we in the Congress, the United States, is facing as we review through that 9/11 Commission the gravity of the charges that have been made by him?

If in the summer of 2001 he saw the threat from al-Qaida as grave as he now says it was, and if he found the response of the administration so inadequate, as he now says it was, why did he wait until Sunday, March 21 of 2004 to make his concerns known? It simply does not make sense.

There is not a single public record of Mr. Clarke making any objection whatsoever in the period leading up to or following the 9/11 attacks. There is nothing in the public record. There is no threat from him to resign. There is no public protest. There is no plea to the President, to the Congress, to the public to heed the advice he now says was ignored.

If Mr. Clarke held his tongue because he was loyal, then shame on him for putting policies above principle, but if he is manufacturing these charges for some sort of personal profit or some sort of political gain, he is a shame to this Government. Fortunately, I have not had the opportunity to work with such an individual who would write solicitous and self-defending e-mails to his supervisor, the national security adviser, and then by his own admission lie to the press out of some self-conceived notion of loyalty, to reverse himself on all accounts for the sale of a book, a book which obviously is very popular. It is selling now as I speak.

The third point I would like to make is Mr. Clarke told two entirely different stories under oath. In July 2002, in front of the congressional joint inquiry on the September 11 attacks, Mr. Clarke said under oath the administration actively sought to address the threat posed by al-Qaida during its first 7 months in office.

It is one thing for Mr. Clarke to dissemble in front of the media, in front of the press, but if he lied under oath to the Congress, it is a far more serious matter. As I mentioned, the Intelligence Committee is seeking to have Mr. Clarke's previous testimony declassified so as to permit an examination of Mr. Clarke on the two differing accounts. Loyalty to any administration will be no defense if it is found he has lied before Congress.

Fourth, notwithstanding Mr. Clarke's efforts to use his book first and foremost to redirect, to shift blame, to shift attention from himself, it is also clear Mr. Clarke and his publisher did adjust the release date of his book in order to make maximum gain from the publicity around the 9/11 hearings.

Assuming the controversy around this series of events does, in fact, drive

the sales of his book, Mr. Clarke will make a lot of money for exactly what he has done.

I personally find this to be an appalling act of profiteering, of trading on insider access to highly classified information and capitalizing upon the tragedy that befell this Nation on September 11, 2001.

Mr. Clarke must renounce any plan to personally profit from this book.

Finally, it is understandable why some of the families who lost loved ones on that tragic and horrible day, September 11, find Mr. Clarke's performance this week appealing. The simple answers to a terrible tragedy, to the very human desire to find an answer of why, to help explain why on that beautiful fall day 2½ years ago a series of events shattered their lives forever.

In his appearance before the 9/11 Commission, Mr. Clarke's theatrical apology on behalf of the Nation was not his right, was not his privilege, and was not his responsibility. In my view, it was not an act of humility but it was an act of arrogance and manipulation.

Mr. Clarke can and will answer for his own conduct, but that is all. Regardless of Mr. Clarke's motive or what he says or implies in his new book, the fact remains this terrible attack was not caused by the Government of the United States of America. No administration was responsible for the attack. Our Nation did not invite the attack. The attack on 9/11 was the evil design of a determined and hate-filled few who slipped through the defenses of a nation, a nation that treasures its freedoms, that treasures its openness, that treasures its convenience. That our defenses failed is cause enough to review the sequence of events leading up to that awful day, and we must and will understand how to do better, balancing our determination to protect our Nation with that equal resolve to protect our liberties.

The answer to Mr. Clarke's—and I clearly feel they are self-serving—charges is that, in fact, we all bear that responsibility, and we recognize that. Every one of us who served in Government before and at the time of the 9/11 attacks also has the responsibility to do our best to avoid such tragedy in the future. If we are to learn lasting lessons from the examination of the 9/11 attacks, it must be toward this end, not an exercise in finger pointing, not an exercise in blame shifting, not an exercise in political score settling.

EXHIBIT 1

TRANSCRIPT: CLARKE PRAISES BUSH TEAM IN '02

(WASHINGTON.—The following transcript documents a background briefing in early August 2002 by President Bush's former counterterrorism coordinator Richard A. Clarke to a handful of reporters, including Fox News' Jim Angle. In the conversation, cleared by the White House on Wednesday for distribution, Clarke describes the handover of intelligence from the Clinton administration to the Bush administration and the latter's decision to revise the U.S. ap-

proach to Al Qaeda. Clarke was named special adviser to the president for cyberspace security in October 2001. He resigned from his post in January 2003.)

RICHARD CLARKE. Actually, I've got about seven points, let me just go through them quickly. Um, the first point, I think the overall point is, there was no plan on Al Qaeda that was passed from the Clinton administration to the Bush Administration.

Second point is that the Clinton administration had a strategy in place, effectively dating from 1998. And there were a number of issues on the table since 1998. And they remained on the table when that administration went out of office—issues like aiding the Northern Alliance in Afghanistan, changing our Pakistan policy—uh, changing our policy toward Uzbekistan. And in January 2001, the incoming Bush administration was briefed on the existing strategy. They were also briefed on these series of issues that had not been decided on in a couple of years.

And the third point is the Bush administration decided then, you know, in late January, to do two things. One, vigorously pursue the existing policy, including all of the lethal covert action findings, which we've now made public to some extent.

And the point is, while this big review was going on, there were still in effect, the lethal findings were still in effect. The second thing the administration decided to do is to initiate a process to look at those issues which had been on the table for a couple of years and get them decided.

So, point five, that process which was initiated in the first week in February, uh, decided in principle, uh in the spring to add to the existing Clinton strategy and to increase CIA resources, for example, for covert action, five-fold, to go after Al Qaeda.

The sixth point, the newly-appointed deputies—and you had to remember, the deputies didn't get into office until late March, early April. The deputies then tasked the development of the implementation details, uh, of these new decisions that they were endorsing, and sending out to the principals.

Over the course of the summer—last point—they developed implementation details, the principals met at the end of the summer, approved them in their first meeting, changed the strategy by authorizing the increase in funding five-fold, changing the policy on Pakistan, changing the policy on Uzbekistan, changing the policy on the Northern Alliance assistance.

And then changed the strategy from one of rollback with Al Qaeda over the course of five years, which it had been, to a new strategy that called for the rapid elimination of Al Qaeda. That is in fact the timeline.

QUESTION. When was that presented to the president?

CLARKE. Well, the president was briefed throughout this process.

QUESTION. But when was the final September 4 document? (Interrupted.) Was that presented to the president?

CLARKE. The document went to the president on September 10, I think.

QUESTION. What is your response to the suggestion in the [Aug. 12, 2002] Time [magazine] article that the Bush administration was unwilling to take on board the suggestion made in the Clinton administration because of animus against the—general animus against the foreign policy?

CLARKE. I think if there was a general animus that clouded their vision, they might not have kept the same guy dealing with terrorism issue. This is the one issue where the National Security Council leadership decided continuity was important and kept the same guy around, the same team in place. That doesn't sound like animus against uh the previous team to me.

JIM ANGLE. You're saying that the Bush administration did not stop anything that the Clinton administration was doing while it was making these decisions, and by the end of the summer had increased money for covert action five-fold. Is that correct?

CLARKE. All of that's correct.

ANGLE. OK.

QUESTION. Are you saying now that there was not only a plan per se, presented by the transition team, but that it was nothing proactive that they had suggested?

CLARKE. Well, what I'm saying is, there are two things presented. One, what the existing strategy had been. And two, a series of issues—like aiding the Northern Alliance, changing Pakistan policy, changing Uzbek policy—that they had been unable to come to um, any new conclusions, um, from '98 on.

QUESTION. Was all of that from '98 on or was some of it—

CLARKE. All of those issues were on the table from '98 on.

ANGLE. When in '98 were those presented?

CLARKE. In October of '98.

QUESTION. In response to the Embassy bombing?

CLARKE. Right, which was in September.

QUESTION. Were all of those issues part of alleged plan that was late December and the Clinton team decided not to pursue because it was too close to—

CLARKE. There was never a plan, Andrea. What there was was these two things: One, a description of the existing strategy, which included a description of the threat. And two, those things which had been looked at over the course of two years, and which were still on the table.

QUESTION. So there was nothing that developed, no documents or new plan of any sort?

CLARKE. There was no new plan.

QUESTION. No new strategy—I mean, I don't want to get into a semantics—

CLARKE. Plan, strategy—there was no, nothing new.

QUESTION. 'Til late December, developing—

CLARKE. What happened at the end of December was that the Clinton administration NSC principles committee met and once again looked at the strategy, and once again looked at the issues that they had brought, decided in the past to add to the strategy. But they did not at that point make any recommendations.

QUESTION. Had those issues evolved at all from October of '98 'til December of 2000?

CLARKE. Had they evolved? Um, not appreciably.

ANGLE. What was the problem? Why was it so difficult for the Clinton administration to make decisions on those issues?

CLARKE. Because they were tough issues. You know, take, for example, aiding the Northern Alliance. Um, people in the Northern Alliance had a, sort of bad track record. There were questions about the government, there were questions about drug-running, there was questions about whether or not in fact they would use the additional aid to go after Al Qaeda or not. Uh, and how would you stage a major new push in Uzbekistan or somebody else or Pakistan to cooperate?

One of the big problems was that Pakistan at the time was aiding the other side, was aiding the Taliban. And so, this would put, if we started aiding the Northern Alliance against the Taliban, this would have put us directly in opposition to the Pakistani government. These are not easy decisions.

ANGLE. And none of that really changed until we were attacked and then it was—

CLARKE. No, that's not true. In the spring, the Bush administration changed—began to change Pakistani policy, um, by a dialogue that said we would be willing to lift sanctions. So we began to offer carrots, which

made it possible for the Pakistanis, I think, to begin to realize that they could go down another path, which was to join us and to break away from the Taliban. So that's really how it started.

QUESTION. Had the Clinton administration in any of its work on this issue, in any of the findings or anything else, prepared for a call for the use of ground forces, special operations forces in any way? What did the Bush administration do with that if they had?

CLARKE. There was never a plan in the Clinton administration to use ground forces. The military was asked at a couple of points in the Clinton administration to think about it. Um, and they always came back and said it was not a good idea. There was never a plan to do that.

(Break in briefing details as reporters and Clarke go back and forth on how to source quotes from this backgrounder.)

ANGLE. So, just to finish up if we could then, so what you're saying is that there was no—one, there was no plan; two, there was no delay; and that actually the first changes since October of '98 were made in the spring months just after the administration came into office?

CLARKE. You got it. That's right.

QUESTION. It was not put into an action plan until September 4, signed off by the principals?

CLARKE. That's right.

QUESTION. I want to add though, that NSPD—the actual work on it began in early April.

CLARKE. There was a lot of in the first three NSPDs that were being worked in parallel.

ANGLE. Now the five-fold increase for the money in covert operations against Al Qaeda—did that actually go into effect when it was decided or was that a decision that happened in the next budget year or something?

CLARKE. Well, it was gonna go into effect in October, which was the next budget year, so it was a month away.

QUESTION. That actually got into the intelligence budget?

CLARKE. Yes it did.

QUESTION. Just to clarify, did that come up in April or later?

CLARKE. No, it came up in April and it was approved in principle and then went through the summer. And you know, the other thing to bear in mind is the shift from the rollback strategy to the elimination strategy. When President Bush told us in March to stop swatting at flies and just solve this problem, then that was the strategic direction that changed the NSPD from one of rollback to one of elimination.

QUESTION. Well can you clarify something? I've been told that he gave that direction at the end of May. Is that not correct?

CLARKE. No, it was March.

QUESTION. The elimination of Al Qaeda, get back to ground troops—now we haven't completely done that even with a substantial number of ground troops in Afghanistan. Was there, was the Bush administration contemplating without the provocation of September 11th moving troops into Afghanistan prior to that to go after Al Qaeda?

CLARKE. I can not try to speculate on that point. I don't know what we would have done.

QUESTION. In your judgment, is it possible to eliminate Al Qaeda without putting troops on the ground?

CLARKE. Uh, yeah, I think it was. If we'd had Pakistani, Uzbek and Northern Alliance assistance.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO HOOSIER ESSAY CONTEST WINNERS

• Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, today I wish to share with my colleagues the winners of the 2003–2004 Dick Lugar/Indiana Farm Bureau/Farm Bureau Insurance Companies Youth Essay Contest.

In 1985, I joined with the Indiana Farm Bureau to sponsor an essay contest for 8th grade students in my home state. The purpose of this contest was to encourage young Hoosiers to recognize and appreciate the importance of Indiana agriculture in their lives and subsequently, craft an essay responding to the assigned theme. I, along with my friends at the Indiana Farm Bureau and Farm Bureau Insurance Companies, am pleased with the annual response to this contest and the quality of the essays received over the years.

I congratulate Elizabeth A. Mercer, of Boone County, and Eric Webb, of Johnson County, as winners of this year's contest, and I ask that the complete text of their respective essays for the RECORD. Likewise, I ask that the names of all of the district and county winners of the 2003–2004 Dick Lugar/Indiana Farm Bureau/Farm Bureau Insurance Companies Youth Essay Contest.

The material follows:

GROCERY SHOPPING STARTS ON HOOSIER FARMS

(By Elizabeth A. Mercer—Boone County)

Indiana farms have a part in many food items around the world. Without farmers our country, even our world, would be starving. In the past, I knew that farmers were a big part of the "Food Chain." Being a daughter of a farmer, I have learned that farmers begin the "Food Chain."

Starting my journey through the grocery store, I realize Hoosier farms are in all parts of the store. In the produce section, Hoosier farms raise celery, carrots, broccoli, cabbage, green beans, lettuce, peas, squash, cucumbers, zucchini, sweet corn, apples, potatoes, watermelons, cantaloupe, strawberries, tomatoes, and pumpkins. Produce grown by Indiana farmers is a crop, which adds value and income to their farming operation.

Another section of the grocery store is the meat section. Meats produced in Indiana are beef, pork, chicken, turkey, elk, buffalo, sheep, fish, and duck. Indiana is the number one state in the USA for duck production.

In the baking aisle corn syrup, corn meal, and corn oil are produced from corn of Indiana farmers. Half of Indiana's corn is raised for animal feed. A large portion of the remainder is used to produce high fructose corn syrup. Corn syrup is used in soft drinks, fruit juices, sport drinks, and canned fruits.

Indiana soybeans are processed into soybean oil. Soybean oil is used in many baked goods such as breads, cakes, snack cakes, chips, and cookies.

Wheat grown in Indiana is soft red winter wheat. Contrary to popular belief, bread is not made from Indiana wheat. Indiana wheat is used to produce pastas.

From now on, when I walk through the grocery store I will know Hoosier farms have made a difference in the food supply for our country and our world. I am proud to say, "My dad is a Hoosier farmer."

GROCERY SHOPPING STARTS ON HOOSIER FARMS

(By Eric Webb—Johnson County)

Mom was planning the usual week's meals, which meant the dreaded trip to the grocery. I went with mom and we started down the aisles. As we were putting the items in the cart, I noticed that several of the items were from Indiana farms. This surprised me a lot. I thought all of the items that may family got were imported.

You could almost group these items by meal. For breakfast, you could have Walker eggs from the Johnson County area. You can add some Emege ham for an omelette. For lunch, you can enjoy Perdue chicken with homegrown tomatoes on two slices of Wonder bread. You can then wash it down with some Maplehurst milk. For dinner, you can have steak, corn, fresh green beans and wonderful seedless watermelons or cantaloupe. Let us not forget the late night snack of Orville Redenbacher popcorn while watching a movie. These items represent some of Johnson County's, as well as other Indiana county's products.

Other Indiana farm products that can be found in local groceries include Roseacre Farm eggs, the world's largest producer, and Adrian Orchard apples. With Halloween and Thanksgiving approaching, do not forget about Waterman's Market pumpkins and hot apple cider, Brown County apple butter and special fresh turkey from Jasper's Sager Turkey farm.

In conclusion, I have only skimmed the surface of the products available from Indiana farmers. Indiana has more to offer than corn and soybeans. The next time you are shopping, look around and see how easy it is to buy Indiana products and enjoy an old fashion Hoosier meal.

2003–04 DISTRICT ESSAY WINNERS

District 1: Zachariah Surfus (Starke Co.) and Amy Ver Wey (Lake Co.).

District 2: Daniel Peppler (Allen Co.) and Lindsay Shutt (Allen Co.).

District 3: Sean Smith (Cass Co.) and Autumn Cooper (Newton Co.).

District 4: Patrick Ritchie (Wells Co.) and Cindy Muhlenkamp (Jay Co.).

District 5: Keith Trusty (Morgan Co.) and Elizabeth Mercer (Boone Co.)* (State Winner).

District 6: Kyle Jacobs (Hancock Co.) and April Schelle (Henry Co.).

District 7: Bradley Otero (Martin Co.) and Audrey Maddox (Lawrence Co.).

District 8: Eric Webb (Johnson Co.)* (State Winner) and Vanessa Small (Bartholomew Co.).

District 9: Braxton Williams (Posey Co.) and Jamie Frank (Spencer Co.).

District 10: Ethan Wilson (Jackson Co.) and Samantha LaMaster (Scott Co.).

2003–2004 COUNTY ESSAY WINNERS

Allen: Daniel Peppler and Lindsay Shutt.
Bartholomew: Steven Day and Vanessa Small.

Benton: Scott Williams.

Boone: Bailey Keith and Elizabeth Mercer.

Cass: Sean Smith and Kimberly Champ.

Clay: Brandon Blackburn and Kayla Baumgartner.

Clinton: Eric Myers.

Dearborn: Joe Bischoff and Amber Shumate.

Decatur: Cody Sanders.

DeKalb: Stephen Boviall and Shannon O'Rear.

Dubois: Jake Whitsitt and Kelsey Vonderheide.

Fayette: Matt Sterling and Jerica Moore.

Franklin: Tyler Ripperger and Michelle Willhelm.

Floyd: Amanda Hawkins.
 Hamilton: Blake Koness and Alexander Robinson.
 Hancock: Kyle Jacobs.
 Hendricks: Chelsei Reynolds.
 Henry: Justin Stevens and Aprill Schelle.
 Jackson: Ethan Wilson and Kimmi Miller.
 Jasper: Travis Brandenburg and Kayla Culp.
 Jay: Dillon Carpenter and Cindy Muhlenkamp.
 Jennings: John Paul Hyden and Hannah Biehle.
 Johnson: Eric Webb and Katelyn Bird.
 LaGrange: Sarah Miller.
 Lake: Adam Becerra and Amy VerWey.
 Lawrence: Audrey Maddox.
 Madison: Kyle Carter and Nika McCloud.
 Marion: Grant Feldhake and Alexandra Cooper.
 Martin: Bradley Otero and Alysia Potts.
 Miami: Devin Zimmerman and Dreana Sparks.
 Monroe: Brian Morrison and Kristen Bornhorst.
 Morgan: Keith Trusty.
 Newton: Trace Myers and Autumn Cooper.
 Pike: Trent Barrett and Katie Hill.
 Porter: Jennifer Evan.
 Posey: Braxton Williams and Kayla Brenton.
 Pulaski: Weston Bonczek and Linsey Foerg.
 Rush: Scott Moore and Patty Walke.
 St. Joseph: Chris Wheeler and Ellen Schoenle.
 Scott: Connor Caudill and Samantha LeMaster.
 Shelby: Derek Turner and Emily Burgett.
 Spencer: Joey Tempel and Jamie Frank.
 Starke: Zachariah Surfus and Simona Crisam.
 Switzerland: Courtney Cole.
 Tipton: Craig Upstill and Natalie White.
 Vermillion: Austin Boling and Amber Yoder.
 Vigo: Thomas Kinnebrew and Karen Groth.
 Wabash: Joshua Dillon and Cami Givens.
 Warrick: Samuel Schnur and Erika Katterjohn.
 Washington: Brooke Agan.
 Wayne: Chris Kolger and Carrie Burkhardt.
 Wells: Patrick Ritchie and Lauren Schumm.
 White: Luke Evans and Abby Tetzlaff.●

(At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

MURRAY AMENDMENT ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

● Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, let me begin my remarks this afternoon by thanking my friend and colleague, the Senator from Washington, for her leadership in this very important area. Because of her work, and the work of a man whose leadership we all miss dearly, Senator Paul Wellstone, victims of domestic violence have access to programs designed to protect them from what many would agree is the worst type of violence there is. Currently, the Federal Government provides a little under \$500 million in domestic violence prevention and treatment programs. The amendment offered by Senator MURRAY proposes to take our commitment to put an end to domestic abuse to the next level by filling in the gaps left by current law and programs.

As you well know, the goal of the underlying bill offered by my friend and

colleague, Senator DEWINE, is a simple, but important one, to prevent murder. What it says is that the murder of woman and her unborn, viable child is morally wrong and should be illegal. There is no disagreement on that point. The majority of yesterday's debate has been how best to draft a Federal law narrowly tailored to accomplish that goal. What this amendment attempts to remind us is that there are two ways to prevent the murder of a woman who is pregnant. One, you can put in place laws that recognize the loss of life of the mother and the viable fetus and impose the stiffest of penalties on those found guilty of committing such a murder. But equally important, you can put in place protections and programs that prevent this type of murder before it takes place.

The sponsors and supporters of this underlying bill claim that their objective is to protect the life of a woman and her unborn child, but their actions indicate otherwise. A few Members have come to the floor to raise legitimate concerns about some of the provisions of this bill, but for the most part, the arguments offered by my Republican colleagues are nothing more than excuses. I would like to take a moment to address a few of these so-called reasons to not support this amendment and offer a rebuttal.

The first reason given by groups, such as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Right to Life, for their opposition to this amendment is that the underlying bill is "clearly an inappropriate vehicle for this amendment as the issues are completely unrelated." If I understand this position correctly, it appears that the opponents of the amendment believe that domestic violence is unrelated to murder of pregnant women. This position is misguided at best. Let me tell you what the facts are:

In the United States, a woman is more likely to be assaulted, injured, raped, or killed by an intimate partner than any other type of assailant.

Every day, 4 women are murdered by boyfriends or husbands.

This year alone, 240,000 pregnant women were physically abused by their intimate partners.

Sixty percent of all battered women are beaten while they are pregnant.

Women are most likely to be killed while attempting to leave their abuser. In fact, women who attempt to escape are at a 75 percent higher risk of being murdered than their peers. The No. 1 reason women leave abusers is to protect their children, born and unborn.

Homicide is the leading cause of death for pregnant women and evidence suggests that a significant portion of all female homicide victims are killed by their intimate partners.

Let me read for you a quote from an ABC News article dated April 25, 2003:

"Most pregnant women are killed by people they know, like husbands or boyfriends," said Pat Brown, a criminal profiler and CEO of the Sexual Homicide Exchange . . .

"Sometimes it depends on how far along the woman is in the pregnancy . . . If it's a serial killer, they normally go after women who may be three months pregnant and are not showing very much . . . With husbands and boyfriends, the women tend to be eight months pregnant . . . they can see the woman and the unborn child as something in the way, keeps them from living the lifestyle they want."

In fact, one of the stories told by my colleague from Kansas was of Tracy Marciniak, whose unborn child was murdered by his abusive father a week before he was due to be born. The Senator from Kansas was right, it would be unfair for anyone to say that there was no murder victim in that case. But it is equally unfair for him and others on the other side of the aisle to claim that there was not a victim of domestic violence in that case.

Another argument that has been made is that this amendment cannot be passed because if it did it would kill this bill. That is simply not true. With the Murray amendment attached, there is nothing to prevent the House of Representatives from taking up and passing the amended version as soon as tomorrow. If they did, the bill could be signed by the President sometime next week and could become law within a week. The reason that is "not possible" is not a matter of Senate procedure or rules. It is not possible because the House Republicans' mode of leadership is "our way or the highway." It is not possible because they refuse to fund programs that help stop a murder before it happens. It is not possible because they are more interested in making a political point than making a difference.

Finally, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have claimed that they cannot support this because it calls for additional resources, and being in a deficit, we cannot afford to bring additional resources to bear on this issue. Senator MURRAY's amendment calls for an additional \$400 million over 5 years to help fill in the gaps left by current domestic violence programs. With less than \$100 million a year, we can make a difference in the lives of the 4 million who have been or will be abused by an intimate partner this year alone, save the fact that domestic violence results in a net loss of \$18.4 billion a year for business owners and taxpayers.

Here is what the truth is. When something is a priority for this administration, we have the resources, and when it is not, we are broke. The recently passed budget included \$27 billion in tax cuts for people whose income is over \$1 million a year. How is it we can find money for this and then claim the deficit as an excuse for opposing an amendment that uses less than one-tenth of 1 percent of that funding to save lives? President Bush claims that the purpose of this bill is to protect women, but at the same time his budget cuts funding for violence against women programs by \$10 million, rape prevention funding by \$29 million, and freezes funding for the domestic violence hot line and domestic

abuse shelters. I think that is out of line with what the American people thinks, and it is certainly out of line with what I think.

As I said earlier, if my colleagues have legitimate reasons to oppose this amendment, we are happy to listen. In fact, we are willing to do what is necessary to get past any partisan difference and to move this issue forward. Unfortunately, our colleagues are not. I think you have to ask yourselves, then, what is this debate really all about?•

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 3717. To increase the penalties for violations by television and radio broadcasters of the prohibitions against transmissions of obscene, indecent, and profane material, and for other purposes.

H.R. 339. To prevent legislative and regulatory functions from being usurped by civil liability actions brought or continued against food manufacturers, marketers, distributors, advertisers, sellers, and trade associations for claims of injury relating to a person's weight gain, obesity, or any health condition associated with weight gain or obesity.

S. 2236. A bill to enhance the reliability of the electric system.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-6792. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendments to the Privacy Act and Freedom of Information Act; Implementation" (RIN3069-AB07) received on March 25, 2004; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6793. A communication from the Director, Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Office's standard of reasonable assurance pertaining to the effectiveness of its internal management controls during Fiscal Year 2003; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6794. A communication from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Cred-

it Administration, transmitting, the Administration's proposed budget for Fiscal Year 2005; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6795. A communication from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Report relative to the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6796. A communication from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to NASA's annual inventory of commercial activities performed by federal government sources; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6797. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the Department of Commerce's Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2003 of the Department's Bureau of Industry and Security; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6798. A communication from the Director, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to actions taken in respect to the New England fishing capacity reduction initiative; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6799. A communication from the Associate Chief, Competition Policy Division, Wireline Competition Division, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Section 272(b)'s 'Operate Independently' Requirement for Section 272 Affiliates; WC Docket No. 03-228; FCC 04-54" (WC Doc. 03-228) received on March 25, 2004; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6800. A communication from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Brazil and Spencer, Indiana)" (MB Doc. No. 03-192) received on March 25, 2004; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6801. A communication from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Florence, Quinby, Greeleyville, and Wedgefield, SC and Savannah GA)" (MB Doc. No. 03-35) received on March 25, 2004; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6802. A communication from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.622(b), Table of Allotments, DTV Broadcast Stations; Albany, NY" (MB Doc. No. 02-92) received on March 25, 2004; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6803. A communication from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.606(b), Table of Allotments, DTV Broadcast Stations, Saranac Lake, NY" (MB Doc. No. 03-213) received on March 25, 2004; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6804. A communication from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Sec-

tion 73.606(b), Table of Allotments, TV Broadcast Stations, Bend, OR" (MM Doc. No. 01-82) received on March 25, 2004; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6805. A communication from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.606(b), Table of Allotments, TV Broadcast Stations; Osage Beach, MO" (MB Doc. No. 03-207) received on March 25, 2004; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6806. A communication from the Senior Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Caledonia and Upper Sandusky, Ohio)" (MB Doc. No. 03-7) received on March 25, 2004; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6807. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Review of Part 87 of the Commission's Rules Concerning the Aviation Radio Services" (FCC03-238) received on March 25, 2004; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6808. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Effective Date in 47 CFR 90.209(b)(6)" (FCC03-306) received on March 25, 2004; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6809. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Parts 13 and 80 of the Commission's Rules Concerning Maritime Communications. Petition for Rule Making Filed by Globe Wireless. Amendment of the Commission's Rules Concerning Maritime Communications" (FCC04-3) received on March 25, 2004; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6810. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of the Commission's Rules Concerning Maritime Communications. Petition for Rule Making Filed by Regionet Wireless License, LLC" (FCC03-270) received on March 25, 2004; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6811. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Compatibility With Enhanced 911 Emergency Calling Systems; PSAP E911 Service Readiness" (FCC02-318) received on March 25, 2004; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6812. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, Policy and Rules Division, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Part 2 of the Commission's Rules to Realign the 76-81 GHz Band and the Frequency Range Above 95 GHz Consistent with International Allocation Changes (Report and Order)" (FCC04-20) received on March 25, 2004; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6813. A communication from the Division Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau,

Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "In the Matter of Multi-Association Group Plan for Regulation of Interstate Services of Non-Price Cap Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers and Interexchange Carriers; Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service" (FCC04-31) received on March 25, 2004; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6814. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Coast Guard, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Allowing Alternatives to Incandescent Lights, and Establishing Standards for New Lights, in Private Aids to Navigation [USCG-2000-7466]" (RIN1625-AA66) received on March 25, 2004; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6815. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Coast Guard, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety/Security Zone Regulations: New Tacoma Narrows Bridge Construction [CGD 13-03-025]" (RIN1625-AA00) received on March 25, 2004; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6816. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Coast Guard, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Regulations (Including 3 Regulations): [CGD05-04-040], [CGD01-04-020], [CGD01-04-016]" (RIN1625-AA09) received on March 25, 2004; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6817. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Prohibiting Directed Fishing for Pacific Cod by Vessels Catching Pacific Cod for Processing by the Offshore Component in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" received on March 23, 2004; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6818. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modification of Closure Date for Atka Mackerel in the First HLA Fishery in Statistical Area 543" received on March 23, 2004; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6819. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Prohibiting Directed Fishing for Pacific Cod by Vessels Catching Pacific Cod for Processing by the Inshore Component in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" received on March 23, 2004; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-6820. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Trip Limit Increase in the Commercial Hook-and-Line Fishery for King Mackerel in the Florida East Coast Subzone from 50-75 Fish per day or From the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ)" received on March 23, 2004; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of committee was submitted:

By Mr. LUGAR, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

[Treaty Doc. 107-7 The Protocol to the Agreement of the International Atomic Energy Agency Regarding Safeguards in the United States (Exec. Rept. No. 108-12)]

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein),

SECTION 1. SENATE ADVICE AND CONSENT SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS AND UNDERSTANDINGS.

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Protocol Additional to the Agreement between the United States of America and the International Atomic Energy Agency for the Application of Safeguards in the United States of America, with Annexes, signed at Vienna June 12, 1998 (T. Doc. 107-7) subject to the conditions in section 2 and the understandings in section 3.

SEC. 2. CONDITIONS.

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following conditions, which shall be binding upon the President:

(1) CERTIFICATIONS REGARDING THE NATIONAL SECURITY EXCLUSION, MANAGED ACCESS, AND DECLARED LOCATIONS.—Prior to the deposit of the United States instrument of ratification, the President shall certify to the appropriate congressional Committees that, not later than 180 days after the deposit of the United States instrument of ratification—

(A) all necessary regulations will be promulgated and will be in force regarding the use of the National Security Exclusion under Article 1.b of the Additional Protocol, and that such regulations shall be made in accordance with the principles developed for the application of the National Security Exclusion;

(B) the managed access provisions of Articles 7 and 1.c of the Additional Protocol shall be implemented in accordance with the appropriate and necessary inter-agency guidance and regulation regarding such access; and

(C) the necessary security and counter-intelligence training and preparation will have been completed for any declared locations of direct national security significance.

(2) CERTIFICATION REGARDING SITE VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENTS. Prior to the deposit of the United States instrument of ratification, the President shall certify to the appropriate congressional Committees that the necessary site vulnerability assessments regarding activities, locations, and information of direct national security significance to the United States will be completed not later than 180 days after the deposit of the United States instrument of ratification for the initial United States declaration to the International Atomic Energy Agency (in this resolution referred to as the "Agency") under the Additional Protocol.

SEC. 3. UNDERSTANDINGS.

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following understandings:

(1) IMPLEMENTATION OF ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL. Implementation of the Additional Protocol will conform to the principles set forth in the letter of April 30, 2002, from the United States Permanent Representative to the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Vienna Office of the United Nations to the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

(2) NOTIFICATION TO CONGRESS OF ADDED AND DELETED LOCATIONS.—

(A) ADDED LOCATIONS. The President shall notify the appropriate congressional Committees in advance of declaring to the Agency any addition to the lists of locations within the United States pursuant to Article 2.a.(i), Article 2.a.(iv), Article 2.a.(v), Article 2.a.(vi)(a), Article 2.a.(vii), Article 2.a.(viii),

and Article 2.b.(i) of the Additional Protocol, together with a certification that such addition will not adversely affect the national security of the United States. During the ensuing 60 days, Congress may disapprove an addition to the lists by joint resolution for reasons of direct national security significance, under procedures identical to those provided for the consideration of resolutions under section 130 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2159).

(B) DELETED LOCATIONS. The President shall notify the appropriate congressional Committees of any deletion from the lists of locations within the United States previously declared to the Agency pursuant to Article 2.a.(i), Article 2.a.(iv), Article 2.a.(v), Article 2.a.(vi)(a), Article 2.a.(vii), Article 2.a.(viii), and Article 2.b.(i) of the Additional Protocol that is due to such location having a direct national security significance, together with an explanation of such deletion, as soon as possible prior to providing the Agency information regarding such deletion.

(3) PROTECTION OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—The Additional Protocol will not be construed to require the provision, in any manner, to the Agency of "Restricted Data" controlled by the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

(4) PROTECTION OF CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.—Should the President make a determination that persuasive information is available indicating that—

(A) an officer or employee of the Agency has willfully published, divulged, disclosed, or made known in any manner or to any extent contrary to the Agreement between the United States of America and the International Atomic Energy Agency for the Application of Safeguards in the United States of America and the Additional Protocol, any United States confidential business information coming to him or her in the course of his or her official duties relating to the implementation of the Additional Protocol, or by reason of any examination or investigation of any return, report, or record made to or filed with the Agency, or any officer or employee thereof, in relation to the Additional Protocol; and

(B) such practice or disclosure has resulted in financial losses or damages to a United States person;

the President shall, not later than 30 days after the receipt of such information by the executive branch of the United States Government, notify the appropriate congressional Committees in writing of such determination.

(5) REPORT ON CONSULTATIONS ON ADOPTION OF ADDITIONAL PROTOCOLS IN NON-NUCLEAR WEAPON STATES.—Not later than 180 days after entry into force of the Additional Protocol, and annually thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional Committees a report on measures that have been taken or ought to be taken to achieve the adoption of additional protocols to existing safeguards agreements signed by non-nuclear weapon states party to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

(6) REPORT ON UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE TO THE AGENCY FOR THE PURPOSE OF ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL IMPLEMENTATION AND VERIFICATION OF THE OBLIGATIONS OF NON-NUCLEAR WEAPON STATES.—Not later than 180 days after the entry into force of the Additional Protocol, and annually thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional Committees a report detailing the assistance provided by the United States to the Agency in order to promote the effective implementation of additional protocols to safeguards agreements signed by non-nuclear weapon states party to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and the

verification of the compliance of such parties with Agency obligations.

(7) **SUBSIDIARY ARRANGEMENTS AND AMENDMENTS.**—

(A) **THE SUBSIDIARY ARRANGEMENT.**—The Subsidiary Arrangement to the Additional Protocol between the United States and the Agency, signed at Vienna on June 12, 1998 contains an illustrative, rather than exhaustive, list of accepted United States managed access measures.

(B) **NOTIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL SUBSIDIARY ARRANGEMENTS AND AMENDMENTS.**—The President shall notify the appropriate congressional Committees not later than 30 days after—

(i) agreeing to any subsidiary arrangement with the Agency under Article 13 of the Additional Protocol; and

(ii) the adoption by the Agency Board of Governors of any amendment to its Annexes under Article 16.b.

(8) **AMENDMENTS.**—Amendments to the Additional Protocol will take effect for the United States in accordance with the requirements of the United States Constitution as the United States determines them.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this resolution:

(1) **ADDITIONAL PROTOCOL.**—The term "Additional Protocol" means the Protocol Additional to the Agreement between the United States of America and the International Atomic Energy Agency for the Application of Safeguards in the United States of America, with Annexes and a Subsidiary Agreement, signed at Vienna June 12, 1998 (T. Doc. 107-7).

(2) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term "appropriate congressional committees" means the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

(3) **NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY.**—The term "Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty" means the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, done at Washington, London, and Moscow July 1, 1968, and entered into force March 5, 1970.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. COCHRAN (for himself and Mr. HARKIN):

S. 2241. A bill to reauthorize certain school lunch and child nutrition programs through June 30, 2004; considered and passed.

By Mr. BIDEN (for himself and Mr. NELSON of Nebraska):

S. 2242. A bill to prevent and punish counterfeiting and copyright piracy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 2243. A bill to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project in the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself and Mr. BREAU):

S. 2244. A bill to protect the public's ability to fish for sport, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. DASCHLE:

S. 2245. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a small business

health tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 529

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 529, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income loan payments received under the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program established in the Public Health Service Act.

S. 1703

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1703, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit against income tax for expenditures for the maintenance of railroad tracks of Class II and Class III railroads.

S. 1709

At the request of Mr. CRAIG, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CORZINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1709, a bill to amend the USA PATRIOT ACT to place reasonable limitations on the use of surveillance and the issuance of search warrants, and for other purposes.

S. 2056

At the request of Mr. BROWNBACK, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2056, a bill to increase the penalties for violations by television and radio broadcasters of the prohibitions against transmission of obscene, indecent, and profane language.

S. 2236

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) were added as cosponsors of S. 2236, a bill to enhance the reliability of the electric system.

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2236, *supra*.

AMENDMENT NO. 2663

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2663 intended to be proposed to S. 1637, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to comply with the World Trade Organization rulings on the FSC/ETI benefit in a manner that preserves jobs and production activities in the United States, to reform and simplify the international taxation rules of the United States, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. HUTCHISON (for herself and Mr. BREAU):

S. 2244. A bill to protect the public's ability to fish for sport, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Freedom to Fish Act. This legislation, cosponsored by Senator BREAU, addresses an unsettling situation arising over access to our Nation's public coastal resources. There is a growing movement to limit the use and enjoyment of America's coastal and ocean waters. This restriction of public access is occurring under the guise of the establishment of marine protected areas. The bill I am introducing today aims to correct a system that would unfairly penalize our Nation's marine recreational anglers. I support the goal of healthy marine fisheries, but I disagree strongly with any method that unnecessarily limits our citizens' access to public waters.

I believe that my record clearly indicates my dedication to defending and improving the health of our oceans and coasts. Recreational anglers are among America's most proactive conservationists and their contributions need to be recognized.

The Act would establish guidelines and safeguards by which the public's right to use and enjoy these resources are preserved in all but the most serious cases. It provides assurances that the public who enjoy recreational fishing will have a place at the table when decisions are made regarding their use of the resource. Secondly, the Freedom to Fish Act will ensure that measurable scientific criteria is used to determine the cause and impact of damage to fishery resources.

Restricting public access to our coastal waters should not be our first course of action, but rather our last resort. Open access to fishing is the single most important element of recreational fishing. We must defend public access against those that would try to restrict it under the cloak of marine resource protection.

I am proud to offer this legislation to bring attention to this important issue and I urge my colleagues to support the Freedom to Fish Act. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2244

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This bill may be cited as the "Freedom to Fish Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Recreational fishing is traditionally the most popular outdoor sport with more than 50,000,000 participants of all ages, in all regions of the country.

(2) Recreational anglers makes a substantial contribution to local, State, and national economies and infuse \$116,000,000,000 annually into the national economy.

(3) In the United States, more than 1,200,000 jobs are related to recreational fishing, a number that is approximately 1 percent of the entire civilian workforce in the

United States. In communities that rely on seasonal tourism, the expenditures of recreational anglers result in substantial benefits to the local economies and small businesses in those communities.

(4) Recreational anglers have long demonstrated a conservation ethic. In addition to payment of Federal excise taxes on fishing equipment, motorboats and fuel, as well as license fees, recreational anglers contribute more than \$500,000,000 annually to State fisheries conservation management programs and projects.

(5) It is a long standing policy of the Federal Government to allow public access to public lands and waters for recreational purposes in a manner that is consistent with principals of sound conservation. This policy is reflected in the National Forest Management Act of 1976, the Wilderness Act, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, and the National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978.

(6) In most instances, recreational fishery resources can be maintained without restricting public access to fishing areas through a variety of management measures including take limits, minimum size requirements, catch and release requirements, gear adaptations, and closed seasons.

(7) A clear policy is required to demonstrate to recreational anglers that recreational fishing can be managed without unnecessarily prohibiting such fishing.

(8) A comprehensive policy on the implementation, use, and monitoring of marine protected areas is required to maintain the optimum balance between recreational fishing and sustaining recreational fishery resources.

SEC. 3. POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States to promote sound conservation of fishery resources by ensuring that—

(1) Federal regulations promote access to fishing areas by recreational anglers to the maximum extent practicable;

(2) recreational anglers are actively involved in the formulation of any regulatory procedure that contemplates imposing restrictions on access to a fishing area; and

(3) limitations on access to fishing areas by recreational anglers are not imposed unless such limitations are scientifically necessary to provide for the conservation of a fishery resource.

SEC. 4. MAGNUSON-STEVENS FISHERY CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT ACT AMENDMENTS.

(a) LIMITATION ON CLOSURES.—Section 303(a) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1853(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(15) not establish geographic areas where recreational fishing is prohibited unless—

“(A) clear indication exists that recreational fishing in such area is the cause of a specific conservation problem in the fishery;

“(B) no alternative conservation measures related to recreational fishing, such as gear restrictions, quotas, or closed seasons will adequately provide for conservation and management of the fishery;

“(C) the management plan—

“(i) provides for specific measurable criteria to assess whether the prohibition provides conservation benefits to the fishery; and

“(ii) requires a periodic review to assess the continued need for the prohibition not less than once every 3 years;

“(D) the best available scientific information supports the need to close the area to recreational fishing; and

“(E) the prohibition is terminated as soon as the condition in subparagraph (A) that

was the basis of the prohibition no longer exists.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Such section is further amended—

(1) in paragraph (13), by striking “and” after the semicolon; and

(2) in paragraph (14), by striking “fishery.” and inserting “fishery; and”.

SEC. 5. NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Section 304(a)(5) of the National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 U.S.C. 1434(a)(5)) is amended to read as follows:

“(5) FISHING REGULATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall provide the appropriate Regional Fishery Management Council with the opportunity to prepare, and to revise from time to time, draft regulations for fishing within the exclusive economic zone as the Council may deem necessary to implement the proposed designation.

“(B) RELATIONSHIP TO MAGNUSON.—Draft regulations prepared by the Council under subparagraph (A) shall be made in accordance with the standards and procedures of the Magnuson Act.

“(C) REGULATION WITHIN A STATE.—Such regulations may regulate a fishery within the boundaries of a State (other than the State's internal waters) if—

“(i) the Governor of the State approves such regulation; or

“(ii) the Secretary determines, after notice and an opportunity for a hearing in accordance with section 554 of title 5, United States Code, that the State has taken any action, or omitted to take any action, the results of which will substantially and adversely affect the fulfillment of the purposes and policies of this Act and the goals and objectives of the proposed designation.

“(D) NOTIFICATION AND HEARING.—If the Secretary makes a determination under subparagraph (C)(ii) to regulate a fishery within the boundaries of such State (other than State's internal waters)—

“(i) the Secretary shall promptly notify the State and the appropriate Council of such determination;

“(ii) the State may request that a hearing be held pursuant to section 554 of title 5, United States Code; and

“(iii) the Secretary shall conduct a hearing requested under clause (ii) prior to taking any action to regulate a fishery within the boundaries of such State (other than the State's internal waters) under subparagraph (C)(ii).

“(E) TERMINATION OF REGULATION WITHIN A STATE.—If the Secretary, pursuant to a determination under subparagraph (C)(ii), assumes responsibility for the regulation of any fishery, the State involved may at any time thereafter apply to the Secretary for reinstatement of its authority over such fishery. If the Secretary finds that the reasons for which the Secretary assumed such regulation no longer prevail, the Secretary shall promptly terminate such regulation.”.

By Mr. DASCHLE:

S. 2245. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a small business health tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to provide relief to small businesses struggling with the high cost of health care.

Rising health care costs are a serious problem for most Americans. The average premium offered by an employer rose last year by 13.9 percent, 4 times faster than wages. This was the third straight year of double-digit increases.

The cost of health care for small businesses is even higher. Health care costs for businesses with 25 to 50 employees rose by 14.3 percent. For firms with 10 to 24 employees, premiums rose by 15.2 percent, and for firms with 3 to 9 workers, they increased by 16.6 percent. In many cases, the increases faced by individual small businesses is significantly larger. I've heard from businesses in my State about premium increases as high as 40 percent in one year.

For many small business owners, increases of this size force them to make tough decisions regarding whether to continue offering coverage, whether to scale back coverage, and whether they can improve wages and make other improvements to their business. At a time when the number of uninsured Americans is growing, our economy is struggling, jobs are scarce, and financial uncertainty affects many too many Americans, the cost of health care is a tremendous problem. Skyrocketing health care costs could pose the single greatest obstacle to entrepreneurship and growth in our economy today.

And many small businesses don't offer coverage at all, not because they don't want to, but because they simply cannot afford it. Both nationally and in South Dakota, only about 55 percent of businesses with 3 to 9 employees offer coverage to their employees, as compared to almost all large businesses—those with over 50 employees.

Why don't small businesses offer coverage? The number one reason they cite is cost. A study by the Kaiser Family Foundation found that about 72 percent of small businesses cite the high cost of insurance premiums as a major reason they don't offer coverage. And a study of South Dakota business owners found that 79 percent said they would be more likely to offer coverage if the costs weren't so high.

Clearly small business owners are desperate for relief. The stories I hear from South Dakota business owners underscore the need.

Last summer, Kathleen Perkins, the owner of Great Plains Coffee Roasting Company in Sioux Falls, wrote to me about the cost of health insurance. In her letter, she wrote, “I recently lost two great employees because as a small business, I cannot afford to offer comprehensive health care to my full time employees.”

Earlier this year, I heard from the owner of South Dakota Magazine, in Yankton. He shared with me the notification from his insurer informing him that premiums would rise 27 percent. The owner expressed his frustration that he faces these increases, even after experiencing past double-digit increases and benefit reductions.

Yet another small business owner in Mitchell wrote to me about yearly rate increases of 10 to 30 percent. She used to pay 100 percent of her employees' cost, but she has had to shift more of the cost onto her employees. And still

she struggles. She said, "I'm not sure how many more increases we can tolerate before we will discontinue this company benefit."

Small employers need relief. That's why the bill I'm introducing today would provide up to a 50-percent tax credit to help small employers pay for insurance for their employees. The legislation would provide a 50-percent credit for businesses with 25 or fewer employees, a 40-percent credit for businesses with between 26 and 35 employees, and a 30-percent credit for businesses with between 36 and 50 employees.

We must take additional steps to address the high cost of health care, the administrative waste in the system, and the growing number of uninsured. This tax credit is a first, important step in that process.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2245

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Small Business Health Tax Credit Act".

SEC. 2. SMALL BUSINESS TAX CREDIT FOR 50 PERCENT OF HEALTH PREMIUMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to business-related credits) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 45G. EMPLOYEE HEALTH INSURANCE EXPENSES.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—For purposes of section 38, in the case of a qualified small employer, the employee health insurance expenses credit determined under this section is an amount equal to the applicable percentage of the amount paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year for qualified employee health insurance expenses.

"(b) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of subsection (a), the applicable percentage is equal to—

"(1) 50 percent in the case of an employer with less than 26 qualified employees,

"(2) 40 percent in the case of an employer with more than 25 but less than 36 qualified employees, and

"(3) 30 percent in the case of an employer with more than 35 but less than 51 qualified employees.

"(c) PER EMPLOYEE DOLLAR LIMITATION.—The amount of qualified employee health insurance expenses taken into account under subsection (a) with respect to any qualified employee for any taxable year shall not exceed the maximum employer contribution for self-only coverage or family coverage (as applicable) determined under section 8906(a) of title 5, United States Code, for the calendar year in which such taxable year begins.

"(d) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) QUALIFIED SMALL EMPLOYER.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified small employer' means any small employer which provides eligibility for health insurance coverage (after any waiting period (as defined in section 9801(b)(4)) to all qualified employees of the employer.

"(B) SMALL EMPLOYER.—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'small employer' means, with respect to any calendar year, any employer if such employer employed an average of not less than 2 and not more than 50 qualified employees on business days during either of the 2 preceding calendar years. For purposes of the preceding sentence, a preceding calendar year may be taken into account only if the employer was in existence throughout such year.

"(ii) EMPLOYERS NOT IN EXISTENCE IN PRECEDING YEAR.—In the case of an employer which was not in existence throughout the 1st preceding calendar year, the determination under clause (i) shall be based on the average number of qualified employees that it is reasonably expected such employer will employ on business days in the current calendar year.

"(2) QUALIFIED EMPLOYEE HEALTH INSURANCE EXPENSES.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified employee health insurance expenses' means any amount paid by an employer for health insurance coverage to the extent such amount is attributable to coverage provided to any employee while such employee is a qualified employee.

"(B) EXCEPTION FOR AMOUNTS PAID UNDER SALARY REDUCTION ARRANGEMENTS.—No amount paid or incurred for health insurance coverage pursuant to a salary reduction arrangement shall be taken into account under subparagraph (A).

"(C) HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE.—The term 'health insurance coverage' has the meaning given such term by paragraph (1) of section 9832(b) (determined by disregarding the last sentence of paragraph (2) of such section).

"(3) QUALIFIED EMPLOYEE.—The term 'qualified employee' means an employee of an employer who, with respect to any period, is not provided health insurance coverage under—

"(A) a health plan of the employee's spouse,

"(B) title XVIII, XIX, or XXI of the Social Security Act,

"(C) chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code,

"(D) chapter 55 of title 10, United States Code,

"(E) chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, or

"(F) any other provision of law.

"(4) EMPLOYEE.—The term 'employee'—

"(A) means any individual, with respect to any calendar year, who is reasonably expected to receive at least \$5,000 of compensation from the employer during such year,

"(B) does not include an employee within the meaning of section 401(c)(1), and

"(C) includes a leased employee within the meaning of section 414(n).

"(5) COMPENSATION.—The term 'compensation' means amounts described in section 6051(a)(3).

"(e) CERTAIN RULES MADE APPLICABLE.—For purposes of this section, rules similar to the rules of section 52 shall apply.

"(f) DENIAL OF DOUBLE BENEFIT.—No deduction or credit under any other provision of this chapter shall be allowed with respect to qualified employee health insurance expenses taken into account under subsection (a)."

(b) CREDIT TO BE PART OF GENERAL BUSINESS CREDIT.—Section 38(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to current year business credit) is amended by striking "plus" at the end of paragraph (14), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (15) and inserting " , plus", and by adding at the end the following:

"(16) the employee health insurance expenses credit determined under section 45G."

(c) CREDIT ALLOWED AGAINST MINIMUM TAX.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 38 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to limitation based on amount of tax) is amended by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5) and by inserting after paragraph (3) the following new paragraph:

"(4) SPECIAL RULES FOR EMPLOYEE HEALTH INSURANCE CREDIT.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of the employee health insurance credit—

"(i) this section and section 39 shall be applied separately with respect to the credit, and

"(ii) in applying paragraph (1) to the credit—

"(I) the amounts in subparagraphs (A) and (B) thereof shall be treated as being zero, and

"(II) the limitation under paragraph (1) (as modified by subclause (I)) shall be reduced by the credit allowed under subsection (a) for the taxable year (other than the employee health insurance credit).

"(B) EMPLOYEE HEALTH INSURANCE CREDIT.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'employee health insurance credit' means the credit allowable under subsection (a) by reason of section 45G(a)."

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Subclause (II) of section 38(c)(2)(A)(ii) of such Code is amended by inserting "or the employee health insurance credit" after "employee credit".

(B) Subclause (II) of section 38(c)(3)(A)(ii) of such Code is amended by inserting "or the employee health insurance credit" after "employee credit".

(d) NO CARRYBACKS.—Subsection (d) of section 39 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to carryback and carryforward of unused credits) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(1) NO CARRYBACK OF SECTION 45G CREDIT BEFORE EFFECTIVE DATE.—No portion of the unused business credit for any taxable year which is attributable to the employee health insurance expenses credit determined under section 45G may be carried back to a taxable year ending before the date of the enactment of section 45G."

(e) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following:

"Sec. 45G. Employee health insurance expenses."

(f) EMPLOYER OUTREACH.—The Internal Revenue Service shall, in conjunction with the Small Business Administration, develop materials and implement an educational program to ensure that business personnel are aware of—

(1) the eligibility criteria for the tax credit provided under section 45G of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by this section),

(2) the methods to be used in calculating such credit,

(3) the documentation needed in order to claim such credit, and

(4) any available health plan purchasing alliances established under title II,

so that the maximum number of eligible businesses may claim the tax credit.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2241, which was introduced earlier today by Senators COCHRAN and HARKIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH). The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2241) to reauthorize certain school lunch and child nutrition programs through June 30, 2004.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. FRIST. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to this matter be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2241) was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 2241

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN MILITARY HOUSING ALLOWANCES.

Section 9(b)(7) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1758(b)(7)) is amended by striking "March 31, 2004" and inserting "June 30, 2004".

SEC. 2. CHILD AND ADULT CARE FOOD PROGRAM.

Section 17(a)(2)(B)(i) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1766(a)(2)(B)(i)) is amended by striking "March 31, 2004" and inserting "June 30, 2004".

SEC. 3. REIMBURSEMENT TO STATES UNDER COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAMS.

Section 15(e) of the Commodity Distribution Reform Act and WIC Amendments of 1987 (7 U.S.C. 612c note; Public Law 100-237) is amended by striking "April 1, 2004" and inserting "July 1, 2004".

SEC. 4. FUNDING MAINTENANCE OF COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAMS.

Section 14(a) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1762a(a)) is amended by striking "March 31, 2004" and inserting "June 30, 2004".

SEC. 5. SUMMER FOOD SERVICE PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 13(q) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1761(q)) is amended by striking "March 31, 2004" and inserting "June 30, 2004".

(b) PILOT PROJECTS.—Section 18(f)(2) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1769(f)(2)) is amended by striking "March 31, 2004" and inserting "June 30, 2004".

SENATE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, we had a very busy week. The Senate continued consideration of S. 1637, the FSC/ETI bill earlier in the week. Unfortunately, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle insisted on offering nongermane amendments to this very important

manufacturing bill, this JOBS bill. In an effort to move the bill forward, we did file cloture with respect to the bill earlier in the week. Despite the importance and critical nature of this legislation to our economy, addressing those sanctions imposed by the European Union on us that are in effect now, we were unable to invoke cloture to finish this bill.

We turned yesterday to the Unborn Victims of Violence Act of 2004. In an overwhelming vote of 61 to 38, the Senate passed S. 1637, the Unborn Victims of Violence Act of 2004. I thank all my colleagues for their handling of the bill. Senator DEWINE did a superb job managing the bill, supported by Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM. Again, they did a tremendous job ushering this bill through.

This legislation does so much to help protect women and their unborn children by establishing, for the first time at the Federal level, a separate crime for the injury or death of a fetus resulting from an attack on the mother. The concept is very simple. If someone attacks a woman who is pregnant, there are two victims and not one. Senator DEWINE was able to hold off any amendments which would have changed the underlying legislation. That was important to do. We accomplished that and the bill will be sent shortly to the President for his signature.

This week we also passed welfare reform extension. It was S. 2231. It is a 3-month extension of welfare reform programs.

We will begin consideration of H.R. 4, the welfare reform reauthorization bill, on Monday. I hope we can consider important and relevant amendments to this bill. I know Members on both sides of the aisle do have amendments to improve the bill. We look forward to addressing those that are germane, that are important to the bill. However, once again, I urge Members to allow us to stay focused on the measure before us and not to slow down the process with political posturing or, what now we have begun to see a lot of, so-called message amendments on the floor of the Senate unrelated to the bill itself.

I do respect all Members' rights to amend the bills, but with that we also have a responsibility, and the responsibility is to legislate.

Last night I had the privilege of obtaining unanimous consent by which we passed the Organ Donation and Recovery Improvement Act, H.R. 3926. The bill promotes organ donation, promotes organ procurement, recovery, preservation, and transportation, all of which is critically vital if we are to address the fact we have 83,000 people right now as I speak waiting for an organ transplant, yet we have too few organs. The supply is too small, it is too few, because we are not capturing all the potential organs. This addresses that disconnect and that disparity.

We also passed the Oceans and Human Health Act this week, S. 1218,

reported by Chairman MCCAIN and the Commerce Committee. This particular bill provides for the coordination and support of Federal interagency ocean science programs, including research on the role of oceans in human health.

We passed H.R. 2584, the international fisheries reauthorization under Chairman MCCAIN.

We also addressed treaties. We ratified two treaties this week, the protocol amending the tax convention with Sri Lanka under Chairman LUGAR, the income tax convention with Sri Lanka with Chairman LUGAR, and moments ago we passed the Child Nutrition Act extension, introduced today by Chairman COCHRAN and the ranking member.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 2236, H.R. 3717, H.R. 339

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I understand there are three bills at the desk due a second reading. I ask unanimous consent that the clerk read the titles of the bills for a second time en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will read the titles of the bills en bloc.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 339) to prevent legislative and regulatory functions from being usurped by civil liability actions brought or continued against food manufacturers, marketers, distributors, advertisers, sellers, and trade associations for claims of injury relating to a person's weight gain, obesity, or any health condition associated with weight gain or obesity.

A bill (H.R. 3717) to increase the penalties for violations by television and radio broadcasters of the prohibitions against transmissions of obscene, indecent, and profane material, and for other purposes.

A bill (S. 2236) to enhance the liability of the electric system.

Mr. FRIST. I object to further proceeding, en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will be placed on the calendar.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MARCH 29, 2004

Mr. FRIST. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 1 p.m. on Monday, March 29. I further ask, following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then begin consideration of H.R. 4, the welfare reform reauthorization bill as provided under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. FRIST. On Monday, the Senate will begin consideration of the welfare reauthorization bill. It is my expectation that amendments will be offered

and debated on Monday, and the chairman and ranking member will be here to begin working through any of those amendments.

As I mentioned yesterday, we will not be having rollcall votes on Monday. Thus, any votes that are ordered on Monday will be stacked for Tuesday.

With that said, I inform my colleagues we have a lot of work to do over the next 2 weeks prior to the Easter recess, and I encourage Senators who want to speak on the bill or

to offer an amendment to come to the floor during Monday's session.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
MARCH 29, 2004, AT 1 P.M.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:07 p.m., adjourned until Monday, March 29, 2004, at 1 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by
the Senate March 26, 2004:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MICHELE J. SISON, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED ARAB EMIRATES.

THOMAS CHARLES KRAJESKI, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF YEMEN.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE NATION JOINS FOSTER CITY IN MOURNING THE LOSS OF AN- DREW DANG

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 2004

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, a favorite son of Foster City, California is being mourned today after losing his life in Iraq. Andrew Dang, a bright and capable and enthusiastic young man, was a U.S. Marine who had served two weeks overseas when tragedy struck. Our hearts go out to his family and friends, former teachers and classmates, and all who remember him in sorrow today. I ask unanimous consent to enter into the RECORD an editorial from the San Mateo Daily Journal.

THE HORROR OF WAR COMES HOME

[From the San Mateo Daily Journal]

For many, the war in Iraq is dealt with in abstract terms. Car bombs and fire fights are on the same level as images in a historical text. Here in the Bay Area, the war in Iraq and the war on terror mean there is longer lines at the airport and more training for local police. We see it as a level on the color-coded Homeland Security Advisory System.

It is removed from our reality despite its presence in current events. Often, our only connection is a daily dispatch from across the world.

Even the names and faces of the casualties of war have yet to be solidified in our collective consciousness. So far, there have been 582 U.S. casualties since major conflict began just over a year ago. Sixty-five of those deaths have been Californians. The Peninsula has been spared—until now.

Today, a Foster City family, the student body of Aragon High School and the community at large mourns the loss of Andrew Dang, a 20-year-old lance corporal for the U.S. Marine Corps whose life was cut short in a gun battle during a patrol near Ar Ramady, Iraq.

The horror of war is now suddenly more real. Those that knew Dang describe the Foster City resident as someone with passion for science and technology who spent his free time building robots and rockets. He was one of the founding members of Aragon's renowned robotics team and by his senior year, Dang was taking multiple advanced placement classes in physics and chemistry.

Dang was a bright, enthusiastic and popular young man who sought out a career in the military to get technical experience. It was his way of getting a college degree and obtaining a career path.

In doing so, he also made a decision to defend the United States in its war on terror. His friends say he believed in the cause he was fighting for. He was proud of his job.

Whether you believe the war is justified or not, its local impact can now be felt on very real terms. Too often, war is politicized and processed into sound bites. But war—and its casualties—is more than politics and candidates.

Politics falls by the wayside when comprehending the loss of such a promising young life. Dang put his life on the line to protect what he believed in. In his heart he sought to

protect the United States from terror and he fought to give the Iraqi people a taste of freedom. And he paid the ultimate price for that belief.

Our thoughts are with his family, friends and the community that knew and loved him. Today, there is a hole in the heart of the Peninsula.

A TRIBUTE TO MRS. TRACY
DOHERTY, ESQ.

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 2004

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mrs. Tracy Doherty, native of Scranton, in Lackawanna County, in my district, who is being named Woman of the Year by the Lackawanna County Federation of Democratic Women.

I ask that my colleagues pay tribute to her achievements as she is honored at a brunch this Saturday at Patsel's in Glenburn, Pennsylvania.

Mrs. Doherty is a true patriot who loves our country. She has been involved in the Democratic Party for more than 20 years. She has spent countless hours volunteering for the Democratic Party in Scranton, in Lackawanna County, and throughout the entire Commonwealth.

Mrs. Doherty was particularly active in the successful elections of her brother-in-law Scranton Mayor Chris Doherty, Lackawanna County Commissioners Randy Castellani and Joe Corcoran, Clerk of Judicial Records Mary Rinaldi and many others.

Mrs. Doherty currently serves as second vice president of the Lackawanna County Federation of Democratic Women.

A graduate of Scranton Preparatory High School, the young Tracy Diskin went on to attend the University of Pittsburgh, where she earned degrees in journalism and political science. She then went on to receive her law degree at Widener School of Law.

She married Tom Doherty nearly seven years ago. The couple have three beautiful children, 4-year-old Tommy, 2-year-old Lucy and 1-year-old Frances. The couple is now expecting their fourth child.

Mrs. Doherty worked in the Lackawanna County's public defenders' office for four years. Now a full-time mom, she finds time to maintain a fine balance between her family and her desire to volunteer.

Mrs. Doherty founded the Society of Irish Women six years ago. She is a member of the Board of Governors of her alma mater, Scranton Prep.

Mrs. Doherty also feels strongly about the fight against cancer and has been a long-time volunteer for the American Cancer Society.

Mrs. Doherty is the Auxiliary Membership Chair of St. Joseph's Center. She volunteers her time to work with handicapped children at the facility.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege to represent a woman who has taken such a leadership role in the community. I ask you to please join me in congratulating Mrs. Doherty for her volunteer work, service and dedication.

TRIBUTE TO SGT. LARRY GIBSON
OF MADISON HEIGHTS, MICHIGAN

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 2004

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Sgt. Larry Gibson, who is leaving the Madison Heights Police Department after 25 years of dedicated service.

During Sgt. Gibson's service, he devoted a good portion of his time to the young people in the community. Specifically, he created the Madison Heights, "Say No To Drugs" rally, and he started the D.A.R.E. and G.R.E.A.T. programs in the city's schools designed to help our students resist drugs and reduce violence.

He was a specialized training instructor in a myriad of areas ranging from accident investigation to gang resistance education.

Sgt. Gibson is the recipient of many well-deserved awards and commendations, beginning in 1984 until the present. The people of Madison Heights, and especially the young people, have been well-served by his commitment to making their city a safer and better place.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing good health, happiness and success to a dedicated police officer, Sgt. Larry Gibson.

TRIBUTE TO JACKSON T.
STEPHENS

HON. MARION BERRY

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 2004

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a great Arkansan, an outstanding citizen, a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy and an accomplished businessman; I am proud to recognize Jackson T. Stephens in the Congress.

Mr. Stephens, known as Jack to his many friends, created one of the most successful corporate finance practices in the country based on the principles his father passed down to him. At a young age, Mr. Stephens learned in order to do well, "we must share opportunities for making money with other people." And as his firm grew, so did the hopes, dreams and nest-eggs of many Americans. Today, Stephens Inc. has become one of the Nation's largest investment banking firms.

While many investors focus strictly on making money for their clients, Mr. Stephens focused on earning their trust—and repaying

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

those who have helped him with incomparable altruism.

Stephens graduated from the Naval Academy in 1947 and has continued to make a major impact on the Naval Academy community and in Annapolis. Mr. Stephens has contributed \$10 million, the largest single donation in service academy history, toward the \$175 million Naval Academy Foundation's Campaign: Leaders to Serve the Nation.

He has held positions on the board of directors of several major corporations, including the Missouri Pacific Railroad, Burlington Northern, Inc., Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., and Dillards, Inc. In 1989, Jack was awarded the first J. William Fulbright Award for International Trade Development. He received a Distinguished Alumnus Citation in 1965 and was awarded an honorary Doctor of Law Degree from the University of Arkansas in 1985. In 1999, Stephens was inducted into the Arkansas Business Hall of Fame.

Mr. Stephens' business acumen is only bettered by his generosity. He is a man who serves as an example of hard work, the success resulting from it and the appropriate way to thank the community from which you came. On behalf of the Congress, I extend my deepest regards for his efforts and gratitude for all he has done to make the world a better place.

HONORING THE GERMAN-AMERICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS, INC.
(D.A.N.K. #13)

HON. FRED UPTON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 2004

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the inspiring achievement of the German-American National Congress, Inc. (D.A.N.K. No. 13) in the Benton Harbor and St. Joseph community. This great nonprofit organization celebrates its 40th anniversary on March 27, 2004. Over the past four decades Americans of German descent, through the work of this organization, have been preserving the traditions and culture of their heritage throughout southwest Michigan.

The German American National Congress (Deutsch Amerikanischer National Kongress), seeks to bring together Americans of German descent in the pursuit of cultivating and presenting their heritage and interests on local, regional, and national levels. These were the primary reasons why this organization was founded in 1959, and they are still among the organization's primary objectives today. The German-American National Congress is the largest organization of Americans of German ancestry. It has some 30 chapters and over 100 associated member societies from coast to coast. I am very proud to have Chapter 13 in the Sixth District of Michigan, and I greatly appreciate all the benefits that the members have provided this community.

It truly pleases me to honor the achievement of Chapter 13, and I hold the members in the highest of esteem. I would like to wish this organization all the best for the future and thank its members for promoting goodwill through southwest Michigan. I'm a frequent visitor to the chapter and there's not been a time that I haven't felt welcome like so many others in southwest Michigan.

IN HONOR OF SERGEANT FIRST CLASS GARY COLLINS

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 2004

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to the life and memory of Sergeant First Class Gary Collins, a brave soldier, a devoted husband, and loving father who sacrificed his life in the defense of freedom on November 8, 2003, in Fallujah, Iraq.

Sergeant First Class Collins was respected and loved by all who knew him, especially the friends and neighbors that watched him go from an outstanding leader and student athlete at Magnolia High School to decorated career Army veteran of unit A Co 1-16th Infantry (Mechanized), of the 1 Brigade Combat Team at Ft. Riley, KS.

Born, May 18, 1971, in Beaumont, TX, Gary Collins entered the Army shortly after graduating from Magnolia High School in 1990. Two short years later, he married his high school sweetheart, Kassie Kennedy. Together they have two beautiful daughters, Taylor age 9 and Landry age 7. Our thoughts and prayers go out to his family and friends during this time.

True to the Army motto, "This we'll defend," Sergeant Collins defended the soil of the United States and protected the liberty of her citizens in Bosnia from 1999-2000, in Korea from 2001-2002, and ultimately with his life in Iraq late last year.

Sergeant Collins career is marked by numerous commendations among them, the Bronze Star, the Purple Heart, and a Meritorious Service Medal. Through the course of his career he was awarded five Army Commendation Medals, seven Army Achievement Medals, three Good Conduct medals, and two National Defense Service Medals, the list continues totaling thirty-six commendations, ribbons, and medals.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in honoring the life and service of Sergeant First Class Gary Collins, an American hero. All of the residents of Montgomery County, TX, and the eighth Congressional District are grateful for his service and dedication to this Nation.

CONDEMNING 200 YEARS OF
OPPRESSION OF HAITI

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 2004

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the execution of democracy in Haiti exposes the warped character of the White House on a scale that the public can find intellectually palatable. The "shock and awe" employed in Haiti is easy for ordinary Americans to understand. Haiti is a tiny and violent pre-emptive strike which has a significance far beyond its size. The administration's racist and open contempt for the democratic government of Haiti is the first and most visible atrocity. While the United States is spending billions to establish democracy in Iraq, it refused to deploy a few platoons of troops to protect the government headquarters

in Haiti. On the contrary the terrorists who attacked the democratically elected president of Haiti were obviously equipped with modern combat weapons that could have come only from the United States. Further complicity of the administration can be documented through the identification of criminals in charge who have served in the past as CIA assets. The intimidation and pressure employed to eject President Aristide and the blanket denial of Haitian refugees any chance to plead their cases for political asylum are two additional outrages which further illuminate the savagery of the selective and racist foreign policy initiatives applied to Haiti. Members who find the size, scope, and complexity of the United States invasion of Iraq to be too overwhelming to comprehend should review the simple diplomatic and war crimes involved in the United States sponsored coup in Haiti. Since Haiti has no oil to seize and control the obvious difference in the case of this hemisphere tragedy versus the case in Iraq is that the occupation will be as short and cheap as possible.

The 200-year chronology of Haiti is scarred with the pock marks of intervention: First, Napoleon was defeated by a slave revolt in Haiti. For almost a decade none of the world's nations would recognize the new Black Republic. Several plots were developed to overthrow the Haitian government by slave holding interests in America; however, none were implemented. In the 20th century the United States has occupied Haiti several times to protect an oligarchy of rich families with current close ties to the Republican Party. Despite continuous interference Haiti in the last 10 years has managed to enact a constitution and conduct democratic elections. The Clinton administration's support for Aristide returned Haiti to a path of democracy after the reign of a 3 year military regime. Former Senator Jesse Helms, a close friend of the ruling rich families of Haiti blocked any economic assistance to Haiti thus defeating efforts to restart the economy. An economically strangled Haiti became the victim of mass discontent exploited by the ruling families and their White House allies. With 2 years left to serve in his term Aristide was ousted by a U.S.-sponsored terrorist rebellion. Napoleon's revenge has again prevailed. The following Rap poem summarizes this chronicle of injustice.

NAPOLEON'S REVENGE

Blacks made him a military jerk
And Napoleon went berserk;
The dictator's disease rained down
Sprouting in confederate ground;
Harassment of Haiti
Became the white rulers' duty:
Black ambassadors speaking French
Was out-of-place and snooty.
The final revenge by Senator Jesse
Has now turned criminally messy:
Terrorist at Haiti's gate
Financed by camouflaged hate,
And the U.S. refuses to debate
This murder of a tiny State.
White House credibility blood
Is now desperately low,
Spin doctors fail to stem the flow.
Napoleon lost the war
When Haiti captured liberty;
On the moral battlefield of eternity
Colon and Condi
Now confront Aristide,
For 200 years
Napoleon's heirs have made Haiti bleed.
The White House refusal to debate
The murder of this tiny state
May seal our President's fate.

HONORING LTC ROBERT ZANGAS,
USMC

HON. TIM MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 2004

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a grateful nation, we honor a man today who lost his life serving our country. Bob Zangas of Level Green, Pennsylvania first went to Iraq as a marine and returned later as a civilian to help rebuild that country.

His job was in public affairs, helping Iraqi journalists and media spread good news about their country. But his work transcended this simple description. He was also a teacher. One of his proudest moments was teaching Iraqi women his craft so they could open women's centers around the country. He was fully aware that he was one of the few western men who had the opportunity to interact with Iraqi women as they began to enjoy the freedom of pursuing careers of their own.

Bob was moved by his time in Iraq. He described a land that "is in desperate need of everything, where he felt he, "was pouring a cup of water out into a dry desert"—but believing some day it would make flowers grow. He lived on a hope that he made a difference and he most certainly did. He believed that our mission in Iraq was right and just. He saw firsthand the gratitude of the Iraqi people, and their gratitude to the Americans who were there to help.

Bob Zangas was proud to represent his country and dedicated to helping his fellow man. Americans and Iraqis alike mourn his passing, but celebrate his accomplishments. His wife Brenda described him as, "a true, patriotic American, humanitarian and Marine and foremost a father and husband." His brother described him as an "American's American" and talked of his "supreme sacrifice in selfless service." Bob Zangas closed one of his last letters with the challenge to, "hang on to your dreams." That is just what he did—to the very end. It is a dream of compassion, a dream of freedom, and for that the whole world is grateful. Thank you Lt. Col. Bob Zangas. Thanks to you we shall hold on to our dreams.

INTRODUCTION OF THE KNOWLEDGE
UTILIZATION IN EDUCATION ACT OF 2004

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 2004

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to briefly announce the introduction of the Knowledge Utilization in Education Act of 2004.

This act, which I will introduce today in the House of Representatives with bipartisan support, aims to increase the use of research-based knowledge to boost student performance and close the achievement gap.

There is a clear need for this legislation. Research shows that student achievement increases when teachers use practices based on scientifically valid research. While the No Child Left Behind Act requires educators to use instructional practices based on research, such practices are not widely used. Given that

students in 25,000 public schools may not be making adequate yearly progress, steps must be taken now to meet the demand for research-based instruction.

Overall, the act would help schools by providing new resources so educators can link education knowledge to classroom practice. The bill would also launch a national leadership initiative to bolster education knowledge.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this act. Congress should act now to give classroom teachers the research-based tools they need to help our Nation's children succeed. Thank you.

HONORING WARREN CENTRAL
RAIDERS FOR BASKETBALL
CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. RON LEWIS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 2004

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Warren Central Raiders for winning this year's Kentucky Men's High School Basketball Championship.

The hours of extra practice under the leadership of Head Coach Tim Riley brought this impressive distinction to Warren County. I want my colleagues in the House of Representatives to know of the pride that I have in representing these students and their families.

Everyone knows about Kentucky's love of basketball and the commitment many make every season to win. The Raiders remarkable 29-7 record reflects the great winning tradition of Kentucky basketball. I would like to commend the Raiders for their team work and determination. Third time's the charm!

OUTSTANDING YOUNG PEOPLE

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 2004

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to bring before this Congress the following outstanding young people who have voluntarily served orphans, public school children, college students, juvenile delinquents, and needy families under the official invitation and authority of government agencies in Russia, Romania, Mongolia, Mexico, Australia, New Zealand, and Taiwan. The excellent character demonstrated by these young people, as well as their commitment to the principles upon which our Nation was founded, have not only attracted the attention of leaders, parents, the media, and students, but it has also brought honor to the United States of America and to the Lord Jesus Christ whom they serve.

Adams, Grant (OK), Adams, Julianna (OK), Adams, Starla (OK), Adler, Robert (IN), Adler, Sally (IN), Aiken, Molly (TN), Allen, Rebekah (KS), Altman, Rachel (OH), Anders, Erin (MI), Anderson, Alice (CA), Anderson, Daniel (CA), Anderson, Donald (CA), Anderson, Julie (CA), Arevalo, David (CA).

Baggott, Jessica (NY), Bair, Aileen (OH), Bair, Robert (OH), Baker, Jordan (OK),

Baldrige, Jana (WI), Bartlow, Jeremy (TX), Bass, Chase (LA), Bean, Amy (CA), Bell, Lauren (TX), Bell, Mike (TX), Bell, Rachel (TX), Bender, Anthony (CA), Bender, Patty (CA), Bender, Steven (CA), Berge, Melanie (MN), Bernhardt, Jacob (IL), Bogner, Melanie (TX), Bolger, Ann (NY), Bolger, Jim (NY), Bolger, Lauren (NY), Bolger, Maave (NY), Bolger, Meghan (NY), Bourne, Daniel (PA), Bourne, William T. (PA), Brock, Jarrod (WA), Books, Joy (WA), Browder, Haley (TX), Brown, James (NY), Brown, Sarah (NY), Brown, Summer (GA), Brubaker, David (PA), Brubaker, Emily (PA), Brubaker, Jeni (PA), Brubaker, Leon (PA), Brubaker, Luke (PA), Brubaker, Mary (PA), Brubaker, Nathan (PA), Buckingham, Elisabeth (OK), Busse, Nathan (OK), Busse, Jenece (MO), Butler, Isaiah (MD), Butler, Kathryn (MD), Butler, Linda (MD), Butler, Lisa (MD), Butler, Luke (MD), Butler, Rachael (MD), Butler, Tol (MD), Bye, Angela (CAN).

Carlisle, Jeshua (MO), Carpenter, Daniel (LA), Cato, David (LA), Cato, Timothy (LA), Cavender, Ben (MI), Chen, Anna (NY), Chen, Faith (NY), Chen, Grace (NY), Chen, Karen (NY), Chen, Stephen (NY), Chen, Timothy (NY), Cheney, Bailey (GA), Cheney, Erin (GA), Cheney, Linda (GA), Cheney, Ted (GA), Christensen, Joshua (MO), Coffia, Jonathan (MI), Coggin, Joshua (VA), Comaris, Shawn (WI), Comstock, Carol (IN), Comstock, Gordon (IN), Conner, Elizabeth (TN), Cook, Kristi (SC), Cook, Timothy (SC), Copu, Beny Bill (IL), Copu, Carmen (IL), Copu, George (IL), Copu, Joy (IL), Copu, Paul (IL), Copu, Paula (IL), Copu, Peter (IL), Copu, Rebecca (IL), Copu, Robert (IL), Copu, Stefana (IL), Copu, Valen (IL), Cover, Michelle (CA).

Dagarin, Ruth (MA), Davidson, Nathan (FL), David, Daniel (VA), Davis, Elizabeth (VA), Dawson, Melody (CA), DeBoer, Stephen (IL), DeMaise, Laura (IN), Dettwyler, Brad (OR), Diel, Jonathan (WI), Dillon, Kirsten (CA), Dingwall, Robert (FL), Donnenworth, Kimberly (KS), Dowden, Corey (TX), Drinkall, Craig (IL), Dudley, Crystal (TX), Dudley, Wes (MI), Dunnam, Rebecca (GA), Dzimianski, Sara (GA).

Elgard, Briana (MN), Elliott, Paul (OK), Emhof, Kalen (FL), Ewing, Crystal (MN).

Fagala, Jessica (OK), Fear, Andrew (FL), Feig, Nathaniel (WI), Fellers, Susana (MN), Ferguson, Sarah (TX), Fite, Joshua (AR), Furlong, Michael (TX).

Gaffney, Camille (MI), Garabedian, Krikor (CAN), Garner, Lisa (TX), Gentz, Benjamin (IA), Gergeni, Judy (IN), Gergeni, Rodger (IN), Gillson, Kirsten (MN), Gillson, Micale (MN), Gillson, Rowan (MN), Glasgow, Anneliese (OH), Glasgow, Kirsten (OH), Gothard, William, Goodwin, Joshua (CA), Gray, Charissa (OR), Gwin, Jennifer (SC).

Hagemeyer, Leah (CA), Hall, Parys (PA), Hargrove, Sarah (OH), Hausner, Zachary (MO), Havlik, Timothy (MN), Hawkins, Donald (OR), Hawkins, Jonathan (OR), Hawkins, Sally (OR), Hawkins, Susan (OR), Haynes, Esther (OK), Haynes, Harriet (OK), Haynes, Herbert (OK), Haynes, Mary (OK), Heisey, Joel (PA), Henderson, Johanna (FL), Hill, John (IA), Holley, Melanie (MI), Hoppe, Jonathan (MN), Hordyk, Jaclyn (CAN), Horneman, Hosea (FL), Houser, Galen (CA), Huber, Monica (PA), Hutson, Kristin (MO), Hullinger, Jennifer (IL).

Jefferies, Megan (MI), Jensen, Joy (IL), Jernigan, Ginger (FL), Johnson, Alanna (MI), Johnson, Benjamin (PA), Johnson, Katie (IN), Johnson, James (MI), Johnson, Juliana (PA), Josephsen, John (MT), Joyner, Sarah (NC).

Kaessner, Jennifer (CO), Karam, Rebecca (FL), Kjos, Stephen (MN), Klassen, Jonathan (TX), Koby, Keith (MI), Koby, Penny (MI).

Lafaurie, Majorie (NY), Leigh, Daniel (MS), Leigh, Sarah Catherine (MS), Levendusky, Tim (OK), Liljenberg, Zachary (WA), Lindemann, Ingrid (WA), Linhardt, David (KS), Lipp, Christopher (CAN), Ludden, Naomi (IN), Lundmark, Samuel (PA), Lyons, Naomi (IL), Lyons, Rachel (IL).

Mancillas, Gonzalo (MEX), Mancillas, Yolando (MEX), Marsh, Jeremy (NC), Martens, Brooke (MI), Martens, Timothy (MI), Martin, Brooke (MT), Martin, Gabrielle (IL), Martin, Jonathan (PA), Martin, Samuel (IL), Martin, Stephen (IL), Matchak, Joel (CA), Mattix, George (IL), Mays, Isaiah, (CA), McCloy, Mike (TX), McCray, Elizabeth (AR), McCray, Ellianna (AR), McCray, Emily (AR), McCray, James (AR), McCray, Jason (AR), McCray, Jo (AR), McCray, Kevin (AR), McCray, Melissa (AR), McCray, Mitchell (AR), McCray, Virginia (AR), McCurdy, Terry (MI), McDonald, Brandon (WI), McDonald, Jessica (WI), McEndarfer, Andrew (OK), McGregor, Benjamin (MI), McGregor, Megan (MI), McNab, Jill (CO), McOlin, Erin (TX), Means, Mary Ann (MI), Melvin, Bryce (FL), Melvin, David (FL), Messick, Rebekah (TX), Millard, Hannah (OR), Millard, Sarah (OR), Miller, Amber (TX), Miller, Debra (IL), Miller, Heidi (IL), Miller, Jeanne (PA), Miller, Katie (IL), Miller, Rachael (MT), Minner, Aaron (MO), Moody, Christina (IL), Moon, Bethany (MO), Morgan, Bert (IN), Morgan, Dorothy (IN), Morgera, John (CT), Murray, Kristin (PA)).

Neu, Daniel (KS), Neu, Michelle (WI), Nisly, Vincent (CAN), Noland, Margaret (MA), Norvell, Joseph (AR), Norvell, Robert (AR), Novotny, Dewey (TX), Novotny, Gina (TX), Nunez, Jeremy (MI).

Osbourne, Heather, Oathout, Floyd (IL), Ouatu, Andrew (CA), Ouatu, Cristian (CA), Ouatu, Gabriela (CA), Ouatu, Jonathan (CA), Ouatu, Joshua (CA), Ouatu, Katherine (CA), Owens, Charis (MO).

Pallock, Christina (IL), Pallock, Dawn (IL), Pallock, Vanessa (IL), Paul, Kristin (IL), Payne, Nikolai (IA), Payne, Tara (IA), Payne, Tosha (IA), Pellascio, Megan (IL), Pellascio, Mike (IL), Pellascio, Susan (IL), Pellascio, Veronica (IL), Perez, Beverly (TX), Perez, Kimberly (TX), Perez, John (TX), Perkins, Glory Lauren (GA), Peterson, Amber (WA), Pintilie, David (CO), Plaiasu, Alina (CA), Plaiasu, Ana-Maria (CA), Plaiasu, Simona (CA), Pleus, Ruthann (FL), Policastro, Lauren (WI), Pollett, Kelly (CA), Powell, Kelsie (OK), Prentice, Valerie (OK).

Randall, Erin (TX), Ralya, Lindsey (FL), Rawson, Ben (NM), Reed, Aimee (NJ), Reed, Charity (TX), Reed, Michelle (TX), Rees, Rebecca (IL), Reimer, Beth (CAN), Reimer, Brian (TX), Reimer, Kate (CAN), Reimer, John (CAN), Reimer, Randall (CAN), Reimer, Timothy (TX), Reitz, Amber (NY), Richmond, Kezia (OR), Richmond, Pricilla (OR), Riness, Jeanna (MI), Risma, Jordan (CO), Risner, James (OH), Robertson, Aaron (AL), Robertson, Adam (AL), Robertson, Alan (AL), Robertson, Amy (AL), Robertson, Andrew (AL), Robertson, Anthony (AL), Robertson, Ashley (AL), Robertson, Autumn (AL), Robertson, Avery (AL), Robertson, Linda (AL), Robertson, Michael (AL), Ross, Charles (IN), Ross, Mary (IN), Ross, Rebecca (IN), Roth, Hannah (NE), Roth, Janell (CA), Roth, Lydia (OK), Roth, Rebecca (OK).

Sanborn, Diane (FL), Schaus, David (BC), Schwartz, Kyle (FL), Sellers, Susanna (FL), Sellin, Dexter (KS), Shafer, Laura (AR), Sherwin, Todd (CO), Silverman, Nathaniel (FL), Skwarek, Gary (CO), Smillie, John (CO), Snyder, Thomas (CA), Sobie, Nathan (POH), Sondergaard, Ron (CA), Southards, Matt (IL), Spillers, Daniel (LA), Staddon III, Don (WV), Stallings, Brandon (CO), Stallings, Grayson (CO), Steed, Bethany (CO), Stein, Naomi (WI), Stewart, Samuel (OH), Stewart, Timothy (OH), Stutzman, Julie (OH), Sullivan, Andrei (NC), Sullivan, John (NC), Sullivan, Roslyn (NC), Sullivan, Sarah (NC), Sullivan, Tom (NC).

Tanner, Justin (TX), Thompson, Ginny (GA), Thomson, Grace (NM), Thomson, Margaret (NM), Thornton, Lauren (GA), Thornton, Paul (GA), Thornton, William (GA), Tiemann, David (MN), Tiemann, Ryan (MN), Tillotson, Vanessa (NE), Tranberg, Catherine (OK), Treahy, Rachelle (AZ), Truhlar, Timothy (IL), Tsui, Nathan (TX).

Vanderhorst, Amy (KS), Vanderhorst, Daniel (KS), Vincent, Ethan (MI), Vinson, Micaela (KS), Visser, Ronald (IN), Wagley, Amy (LA), Wagley, Elizabeth (LA), Waller, Adam (WI), Walklin, Elisa (TX), Walley, Jennifer (NC), Walley, Joanna (NC), Warfield, Charles (CA), Weis, David (OH), Weldon, Sandi (TX), Wenstrom, Angie (FL), Wenstrom, Brittany (FL), Wenstrom, Chris (FL), Wenstrom, Heather (FL), Wenstrom, Jim (FL), Wenstrom, Kimberly (FL), Wenstrom, Matthew (FL), Wenstrom, Michelle (FL), Weston, Jennifer (CA), Weston, Kevin (CA), Williams, Cheri (CA), Williams, Elizabeth (AUS), Williams, Jamie (IN), Williams, Nathaniel (TX), Williams, Randahl (PA), Williams, Richard (AUS), Wold, Amy (MD), Wolfley, Audra (OK), Wright, Charissa (AZ).

Ziesemer, Ben (IL), Ziesemer, Daniel (IL), Ziesemer, Penny (IL), Zrinski-Myers, Brenda (TX).

RECOGNITION OF PAT RICHTER

HON. TAMMY BALDWIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 2004

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Pat Richter and his incredible career as Athletic Director for the University of Wisconsin. After over fourteen years in that position, he is retiring on April 1, 2004.

Pat Richter played basketball, football, and baseball during his college days at the University of Wisconsin, lettering three times in each. He also went on to a professional career in football, but it is his legacy as Athletic Director that will carry on for years to come. Badger fans will always be grateful for his successful efforts in turning around an athletic department that faced financial difficulties, out of date stadiums, and waning fan support. Today, the University of Wisconsin boasts an athletic program that has attained nationwide acclaim for success and innovation both in athletics and academics.

Under Pat Richter's watch, the University of Wisconsin has built modern athletic facilities, including the Kohl Center, University Ridge Golf Course, the Fetzer Academic Learning Center, and the Goodman Softball Diamond. The University has also renovated the

McClimon Track/Soccer Complex, and recently began renovation of Camp Randall Stadium. Badger fans will be able to enjoy these facilities for generations to come.

I am most proud of Pat Richter's efforts toward equality in the athletic department. In his fourteen year tenure, the University of Wisconsin has added three women's sports—softball, lightweight crew, and hockey. The University of Wisconsin now has a policy that strives to have a percentage of female athletes proportionate to the overall female population of students on campus.

The success of Wisconsin athletics under Pat Richter has been phenomenal. The Badgers have won three national championships—men's hockey in 1989–90, men's rowing in 1989–90 and men's soccer in 1995—and a remarkable 49 Big Ten Championships. The football team has won three Rose Bowl games. The women's basketball teams have played in six NCAA tournaments, while the men's basketball team recently played in their seventh NCAA tournament in eight years, a remarkable run that also includes a trip to the Final Four by the 2000 team.

Mr. Speaker, I join all of Wisconsin in recognizing Pat Richter's achievements as Athletic Director and we wish him much success.

THE UNITED STATES, ROMANIA, AND . . . MOLDOVA

HON. JIM GIBBONS

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 2004

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request that the following document be entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. As you may know, many of my constituents and friends in the state of Nevada are of Romanian descent, and it is with those individuals in mind that I make this request.

The Romanian-American Community greeted with joy the fall of communist dictatorships and the dissolution of the former Soviet Union. They also greeted with optimism the declaration of independence of the newly created Republic of Moldova. Their paramount hope was that the people of this republic, of whom the majority are ethnic Romanians, would develop along democratic lines and would become part of the enlarged European family. Their joy was short-lived. Russia soon launched a new geopolitical policy aimed at bringing back to its fold Moldova and other parts of the former Soviet Union. As of March 2004, Belarus is well under Moscow's control, Ukraine is barely capable of claiming its independence, and Moldova has virtually collapsed as a result of new Russian political pressure and economic strangulation. The communist government of Moldova has recently withdrawn the parliamentary immunity of the last members of the democratic opposition and is ready to imprison them. Due to these humanitarian, political, and geopolitical reasons, the Romanian communities of the United States have changed their views and have suggested a new policy toward Moldova . . . Here is their new stand as prepared by Dr. Nicholas Dima.)

THE UNITED STATES, ROMANIA, AND . . . MOLDOVA

This essay represents the position of a large number of responsible and loyal American citizens of Romanian descent with regard to the current status of the Republic of Moldova. Heretofore, we present the facts.

Since times immemorial, the current Republic of Moldova (better known as Bessarabia) has been populated by Romanians. During medieval times, this land was the eastern half of the Principality of Moldova, one of the three principalities that made up modern Romania. Tsarist Russia occupied it for the first time in 1812 and used it to further expand into southeast Europe. Russian interference in the Danube and the Black Sea navigation caused the West to side with Turkey during the Crimean War of 1856. At the end of the war, Russia was forced to retreat from the Danube and southern Bessarabia. Nevertheless, the tsars occupied the whole province again following the new war of 1877. Then, after the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917, the province voted to reunite once and for all with Romania. Unfortunately, the new Soviet Union did not accept the union and somewhat puzzling for us, the United States did not ratify the union of Bessarabia with Romania either.

Between WWI and WWII Moscow promoted a policy of territorial expansion and global communism. In this part of Europe, Moscow pursued the goal of re-annexing Bessarabia and further intruding in the Balkans. This policy was implemented after Nazi Germany and communist Soviet Union signed the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact to divide Eastern Europe. The Soviet republic of Moldova was thus set up in 1940 after the Red Army invaded the province. Actually, in anticipation of the annexation, as early as 1924 Moscow had set up an autonomous Moldavian republic on the left bank of the Dnestr in the Ukraine. Its sole purpose was to prepare the future annexation. When the occupation of the province was accomplished in June 1940, Moscow disbanded the autonomous republic and returned to Ukraine part of it together with the northern and southern parts of Bessarabia. The old name that recalled the Romanian origin of the province was banned from the Soviet vocabulary. To further complicate the issue, Moscow incorporated into the new Moldavian SSR a slice of land on the left bank of Dnestr with the city of Tiraspol as its center. Ever since, this highly Russified industrial area has remained a cauldron of communism and expansionism.

The ethnic Romanian majority of the occupied territory was never asked if they wanted to be part of the USSR. Neither were the other ethnic groups asked if they wanted to be annexed or arbitrarily divided between the newly created republic and the Ukraine. Furthermore, well-informed international circles as well as local survivors have revealed that during and after WWII up to a million inhabitants of Soviet Moldova, mostly Romanians, were arrested, deported or killed by the Soviet authorities. At the same time, Moscow sent hundreds of thousands of Russians to replace the local Romanians and to secure the allegiance of the new republic. Yet, to this day two thirds of the population of this land is still ethnic Romanian although they have been forced to call themselves Moldavan.

Perestroika of the 1980's brought new hopes of freedom to the peoples of the USSR, and by the early 1990's every Soviet republic including Moldova had declared its independence. However, to prevent Moldova's reunification with Romania, the Russians from Tiraspol declared the independence of their region and named it the Dnestr Moldavian republic. Soon after, a war between Moldovan authorities and this territorial entity erupted with disastrous consequences. Ever since the Trans Dnestr region has remained a communist stronghold and a hub of arms trafficking, smuggling, and other illegal activities. It should be stressed that most of the Tiraspol leaders are Russian citizens who were planted there by Moscow in

the 1980's. It should also be underlined that most of them are involved in illicit activities and many have been banned from traveling in West Europe.

After the dismemberment of the Soviet Union, Russia continued to keep military units and huge quantities of equipment and ammunitions in the Trans Dnestr region. As recently as December 7, 2003, for example, "The Washington Post" wrote that this enclave has been led by mafia-style leaders and has remained, an extremely dangerous place for black marketing in weapons. According to "The Washington Post", "this area has 50,000 tons of shells, mines and rockets, enough to fill 2,500 boxcars". The same paper also points out that the Trans Dnestr region has a sizeable quantity of dirty bomb warheads and possibly other weapons of mass destruction ready to be sold to whoever has the cash to acquire them. Nonetheless, the new Russian authorities under President Putin continue to back this separatist region and its leaders. It is obvious that Moscow has not relinquished its expansionist aspirations toward the Balkans and the Black Sea. Actually, several Russian political leaders have stated openly that Moldova, as well as Georgia in the Caucasian region, are areas of traditional Russian interests and that they should be kept under Moscow's control. While the population of the Russian Federation is ailing and suffers grave misfortunes, Moscow is wasting its resources pursuing 19th century geopolitics.

Ever since the overthrow of Ceausescu's dictatorship in 1989, the Romanians looked to the West for guidance and to the East hoping to reunite Bessarabia with the country. Romania, however, has been economically ruined and politically disoriented and does not have the means to resolve by itself this old geopolitical wound. At the same time, the Romanians expected some Western support to redress the situation, but they did not get any. No wonder some Romanians question whether there is a new agreement signed at Malta, similar to the Yalta accords, that leaves the eastern part of Moldova in a new Russian sphere?

At the beginning of the new millennium the European Union is looking toward unifying the old continent. Concomitantly, NATO and the United States are integrating new friends and allies in Eastern Europe. The Balkans, however, is still a dangerous place and is very close to the Middle East and south Asia. Romania has an important geopolitical and geo-strategic location and the Romanians are overwhelmingly pro-Western and pro-American. They have already welcomed American troops and military bases on their soil. Yet, they are questioning the soundness of the official U.S. policy with regard to Moldova.

Indeed, loyal American citizens of Romanian origin are surprised to see that the U.S. is still taking for granted this new state entity that has no merits, no adequate means of survival, and no *raison d'être*. While the world has condemned the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact, Washington continues to accept its legacy. For the time being and given the drive to join NATO and the European Union, the Romanian officials are not willing to challenge the U.S. stand, but the time will come when the issue will be raised again, and the people are waiting. The United States should be proactive rather than reactive and be prepared to deal with this matter in a manner that would not offend the Romanians and would not hurt American interests.

The decade of the 1990's was extremely difficult for the Republic of Moldova. From an economic standpoint, Russia strangled the small republic. From a political point of view, Moscow spent huge amounts of money to

keep it in its sphere. From an ethnic point of view, the local Russians did everything to prevent the Romanian majority from cultivating their culture and pursuing their roots. At the same time, the democratic opposition of Moldova was almost annihilated and by 2000 the Communist Party was brought back to power. Once again in charge, the communists launched a policy of gradual return to the old system. The process of privatization began to be reversed, the free media began to be harassed, and the new authorities started to persecute the pro-Western democratic opposition.

It is worth noting that during the 1990's Moscow approached Romania alluding to the possibility of allowing the reunification of Moldova with Romania. But Moscow warned the government in Bucharest to avoid membership in the NATO and not to trust the Americans because they would betray Romania. Given their historic experience, few Romanians paid any attention. The country opted clearly and firmly for Euro-Atlantic integration. While joining NATO and siding with the United States in Afghanistan and Iraq, Romania has also tried to promote good relations with Russia. This policy has not pleased Moscow.

It appears that the disintegration of Moldova has been one of the Kremlin's responses to the enlargement of NATO. Thus, acting in collusion with the leaders of Tiraspol and in agreement with the new communist government in Chisinau, Moscow endorsed the idea of reorganizing Moldova as a federation. Allegedly, the purpose is to solve the Trans Dnestr conflict and to secure the territorial integrity of the republic. Consequently, the plan of federalization is being advanced in spite of violating the provisions of the very constitution of the state. Accordingly, the new federal organs are supposed to be in place by early 2005. Strangely, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) chaired in 2003 by an American ambassador, concurred initially with this dubious project. The project only advances the geopolitical goals of expansionist circles in Moscow and the murky interests of the leaders in Tiraspol. Moscow has not only tolerated those leaders, it is actually helping them to hold the area as a Russian bridgehead against the West.

A December 4, 2003 editorial of "The Washington Post" reveals that the United States has understood the true nature of Russia's policies in Moldova and Georgia. And for the first time an American administration has taken a firm stand. The editorial emphasizes that Moscow has never fully accepted the independence of Moldova, "a desperately poor country that for more than a decade has lived with a separatist splinter, Trans-Dnestr, that is controlled by an ethnic Russian criminal mafia backed by Russian troops and arms." What Mr. Putin wants, the editorial continues, is "to make Moldova a neutral state, to disband its armed forces, and to give Moscow a veto over its government." The editorial adds: "the American administration is taking steps to thwart Moscow's neo-imperialism."

The situation is somewhat similar in Georgia. The United States is firmly against the disintegration of the two republics. Nevertheless, while the Caucasian Republic of Georgia needs every form of support to strengthen its independence, we strongly believe that the only sound resolution for Moldova is to return it to Romania.

In summary:

The Republic of Moldova is a Romanian land transformed arbitrarily by Moscow into an artificial independent entity. It has never been a separate state throughout its entire history and its very existence is an open invitation to geopolitical instability. It only

promotes Russia's expansionism, even to the detriment of democracy and the welfare of the very Russian people. It is by design directed against the stability of Europe and it represents an insult to the Romanian nation. And, last but not least, in the future, its continuous existence will mar the good relations between the United States and Romania, thus hurting America's interests.

We, responsible and loyal American citizens of Romanian descent, are aware of the risky consequences of modifying borders. We are aware of America's limitations and of Russia's reluctance. But we also believe in America, we believe in justice, and we believe in redress. With good will, wisdom, and an open mind, the problem could be properly addressed. Thus, we recommend that the United States start considering the reunification of this land with Romania where it belongs. Such an approach would avoid further complications and undesirable consequences. To this end we are ready to lend our full and unconditional support.

Nicholas Dima, PhD
Retired professor
JF Kennedy Special Warfare Center and School, Fort Bragg, NC
US Naval War College, Newport, RI

IN MEMORY OF FERN HOLLAND

HON. SUE WILKINS MYRICK

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 2004

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, two weeks ago, in a tragedy personified by the killing of a young woman from middle America, we were reminded of the unsung goodness and bravery of so many Americans serving their country overseas.

On March 9, 2004, Fern Holland, of Miami, Oklahoma, was the first American civilian killed in the Iraq war. Her death has sparked over 200 national news reports, and an outpouring of grief from around the globe. Fern's story has touched people like me who never knew her, but who can now never forget her.

It's rare these days to know someone who is willing to sacrifice the comforts America offers to serve others who are less fortunate. It is even more rare to know a person who is willing to sacrifice their own life in order to improve the lives of others around the world. Fern Holland was an American hero who sacrificed both the comforts of home, and indeed even her life, to make the world a better place. People who exemplify such compassion and courage should be honored, and by telling her story I hope that she will be remembered.

Fern was a successful attorney, first in Tulsa, Oklahoma, and later in Washington, DC. She walked away from a lucrative career to carry out human rights work in violence plagued Guinea, Liberia, and later Iraq.

In her first effort to help others overseas, Fern lived in a remote village in Namibia as a Peace Corps volunteer. She helped the villagers there learn English, and built a computer laboratory to access the internet. Later, Fern worked for the American Refugee Committee where she investigated sexual assaults in a violence-plagued refugee camp in Guinea. There, she established the first sex violence legal clinic that to date has processed more than 100 cases.

Last year, after major combat operations in Iraq concluded, Fern traveled to Iraq and

worked for the Coalition Provisional Authority as a women's rights specialist. She helped establish women's rights, she established service centers throughout Iraq, and she helped found an Iraqi women's political party. The day before her death, Iraqi leaders signed an interim constitution that includes a controversial provision Fern helped draft. It establishes a goal for 25 percent female membership in the national assembly. Knowing of the dangers in Iraq, especially in working to extend women's rights, Fern wrote to friends only weeks before her death, "I love the work and if I die, know that I'm doing precisely what I want to be doing—working to organize and educate human rights activists and women's groups".

These are but a few of Fern Holland's contributions to the world, a world which is a better place because of her. In this day and time, when the world seems dark and dreary, we look to people like Fern Holland who's bright light gives us hope. Fern displayed a compassion and commitment to people that Jesus spoke about when he said, "Greater love has no one than this, that he lay down his life for his friends." Her sacrifice is an example and inspiration to all who strive for a better world, and she will be missed.

RECOGNITION OF TIARA PURIFOY

HON. TAMMY BALDWIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 2004

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Tiara Purifoy of Beloit, WI, who recently appeared on the popular reality television show "American Idol." After being named a semifinalist with her powerful rendition of Whitney Houston's song "I Wanna Dance with Somebody," she was surprisingly eliminated before the singing even started on the wild card show on Tuesday, March 9, 2003. The show, which first aired in 2002, draws a nationwide audience in the millions, two nights a week. "American Idol" brings aspiring singers from across the nation to Hollywood, and awards the winner a recording contract and celebrity status. Tiara was selected at an audition in Hawaii.

While her dream of being the next "American Idol" has not yet come to pass, Tiara is still a star in the hearts of Wisconsinites. Tiara began singing as a small girl at age four in her church choir. She will continue to sing and perform with her traveling family group the Gospel Belles, where she sings lead. Her appearance on "American Idol" was not her first brush with fame, however. She describes her greatest accomplishment thus far as being named Miss Beloit in 1999 because she was able to be a positive example for young people.

Indeed, Purifoy proved to be a positive example to both young and old across the nation when she stood up to judge Simon Cowell, who is known for his hurtful and critical remarks to budding stars' performances. Despite praise from the other judges, celebrated performer Paula Abdul and Grammy Award winning producer Randy Jackson, Cowell told Purifoy she was capable of much more. With her absolute confidence and positive attitude, Purifoy retorted, saying she would let America decide. Indeed, America responded, and Purifoy moved on to the next round.

Even though Tiara is not the nation's new "American Idol," she will continue to share her sweet voice with her friends and family who continue to cheer for her back home in Beloit. Please share this opportunity with me, Mr. Speaker, to honor Beloit and Wisconsin's own American Idol.

BILL TO ALLOW A DEDUCTION FOR EXPENSES PAID IN CONNECTION WITH THE DONATION OF AN ORGAN

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 2004

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to introduce a bill to allow a tax deduction for expenses paid in connection with the donation of an organ.

Mr. Speaker, each year approximately 6,500 people die waiting to receive an organ transplant. However, 25,000 lives are saved due to the generosity of organ donors. While we have made significant strides to promote and encourage organ donation, we still fall short of our goal.

In response to this need, the legislation I now introduce will allow organ donors a tax deduction for up to \$15,000 per donation. Specifically, this bill amends the Internal Revenue Code to allow individuals to deduct qualified organ expenses such as travel and lost wages for donating all or part of a liver, lung, pancreas, kidney, intestine, or bone marrow for human organ transplantation.

Unlike previous bills that have been introduced in the House, this bill does not require donors to wait on what is often a long and tedious grant process to approve reimbursement. The donors will automatically be able to deduct up to \$15,000 in related expenses.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of this bill because I believe organ donors should not have to pay any price or expense for an act of kindness. I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass this important legislation.

DISABILITIES ADVOCATES FIGHT BUSH SECTION 8 PROPOSAL

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 2004

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Administration proposal for a drastic reduction in the ability of the Section 8 program to help people in need has caused a great deal of dismay, especially among those organizations that exist to provide services to the most vulnerable in our society. On March 22, a broad and inclusive coalition of people concerned with people with disabilities, people with low incomes, and others who have legitimate need for assistance sent a very thoughtful letter to the Chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, expressing their strong disagreement with this proposal. As the coalition notes, the funding level proposed by the Administration would mean that "approximately 250,000 low income families with children, senior citizens, and people with disabilities could lose their vouchers."

Mr. Speaker, this will be one of the most important issues on which this House will vote this year, and I ask that this very thoughtful letter by this broad range of groups be printed here for the benefit of the Members who will have to vote on this.

March 22, 2004.

Hon. C. W. BILL YOUNG,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN YOUNG: The undersigned groups are writing to express our strong opposition to the severe cut to the Section 8 voucher program in the HUD Fiscal Year 2005 budget. The President's request for the voucher program is more than \$1.6 billion short of fully funding all vouchers in use. At this funding level, approximately 250,000 low income families with children, senior citizens, and people with disabilities could lose their vouchers.

This shortfall comes at a time when a recent analysis of the American Housing Survey reveals 31 percent of all households had housing problems in 2001. Now is not the time to cut the funding for a housing program that has served as the "linchpin" of our federal housing policy for the last two decades.

We also urge you to oppose the proposed Flexible Voucher Program that would make significant changes in the program's structure. The proposed changes would create a block grant program and eliminate many of the long-standing rules that benefit low income families. Under the proposed block grant, PHAs would receive a lump sum that would not be adequate to serve all current voucher holders. The elimination of statutory requirements including targeting the program to the lowest income families and ending the requirement that tenants pay no more than 30 percent of their income for their rent could have a devastating effect on families across the nation.

The Administration has expressed concern about the growth in costs of the voucher program. This increase was largely the result of rising utilization rates, expansion of the voucher program by Congress, and the widening gap between rental housing costs and family incomes in recent years. However, a recent study by CBO projects that the growth rate of Section 8 expenditures will slow to 1.8 percent in fiscal year 2005. They also project the costs to continue to level off because of the cooling of the housing market as well as increases in wages as the economy recovers.

The Section 8 voucher program is an effective and critical resource. Housing assistance is needed by the many low income families with children, elderly, people with disabilities, and victims of domestic violence who would not have safe, decent, and affordable housing without it. Housing authorities cannot be expected to do more with inadequate resources. We respectfully urge you to provide the necessary funding for all existing vouchers and reject HUD's plan to dismantle the housing voucher program.

Sincerely,

ACORN
Alliance for Children and Families
Alliance for Healthy Homes
Alliance for Retired Americans
American Association of Homes and Services for the Aging
American Association of People with Disabilities
American Association on Mental Retardation
American Baptist Churches USA
American Friends Service Committee
American Network of Community Options and Resources
American Society on Aging

Association for Gerontology and Human Development in Historical Black Colleges and Universities

Association of University Centers on Disabilities

Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law

Brain Injury Association of America

Catholic Health Association

Child Welfare League of America

Children's Defense Fund

Church Women United

Corporation for Supportive Housing

Evangelical Lutheran Church in America

Families USA

Generation United

Gray Panthers

International Union, UAW

Jewish Council for Public Affairs

Local Initiatives Support Corporation

Lutheran Services in America

National Advocacy Center of The Sisters of the Good Shepherd

National Affordable Housing Management Association

National AIDS Housing Coalition

National Alliance for The Mentally Ill

National Alliance to End Homelessness

National Association for the Education of Homeless Children and Youth

National Association of Housing Cooperatives

National Association of Long-Term Care Ombudsman Programs

National Association of Professional Geriatric Care Managers

National Association of Protection and Advocacy Systems

National Coalition for Homeless Veterans

National Coalition for the Homeless

National Council for Community Behavioral Healthcare

National Council of Jewish Women

National Council on Independent Living

National Council on the Aging

National Health Care for the Homeless Council

National Housing Conference

National Housing Trust

National Low Income Housing Coalition

National Mental Health Association

National Network to End Domestic Violence

National Policy and Advocacy Council on Homelessness

National Rural Housing Coalition

National Student Campaign Against Hunger and Homelessness

Network, A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby

Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) Washington Office

Sargent Shriver National Center on Poverty and Law

The Arc of the United States

The Coalition on Human Needs

The Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities Housing Task Force

The Enterprise Foundation

The Leadership Conference on Civil Rights

Union For Reform Judaism

United Cerebral Palsy

United Spinal Association (formerly Eastern Paralyzed Veterans Association)

United Way of America

U.S. Jesuit Conference

Volunteers of America

FREEDOM FOR VICTOR ROLANDO
ARROYO CARMONA

HON. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 2004

Mr. DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about Victor Rolando Ar-

royo Carmona, a prisoner of conscience in totalitarian Cuba.

Mr. Arroyo is vice-president of the group Forum for Reform as well as a member of the Union of Independent Cuban Journalists and Writers. Mr. Arroyo is a leading pro-democracy activist and has been a constant target of the totalitarian regime. Because of his peaceful activism for freedom and democracy, Mr. Arroyo has been harassed, beaten, and imprisoned in Castro's abhorrent gulag.

According to Human Rights Watch, in January 1995, Mr. Arroyo was beaten and thrown in prison for nine days after organizing a ceremony to commemorate the birth of José Martí. In 1996, he was sentenced to eighteen months in the totalitarian gulag and held in a "tapiada" cell—a narrow, dark and extremely humid cell—for "disrespecting" the government. In January 2000, Mr. Arroyo was charged with "hoarding" and sentenced to eighteen months in the gulag for organizing a toy drive and distributing toys to needy Cuban children. In October 2000, he was beaten by the dictatorship's goons on three separate occasions. In October 2001, rocks and bottles containing flammable chemicals were thrown at the home where Mr. Arroyo lives with his wife and children.

Despite these horrifically repressive intimidation tactics, despite being locked in the totalitarian gulag for distributing toys to needy children, Mr. Arroyo has never stopped demanding freedom and democracy for the Cuban people. Even with first hand knowledge of the brutal, inhumane, consequences of depicting the true reality of the totalitarian regime, Mr. Arroyo has bravely continued to write the truth about Castro's nightmarish oppression.

In 2002, Human Rights Watch awarded Mr. Arroyo a Hellman-Hammet grant in recognition of his courage in the face of political persecution. This prestigious grant is awarded annually to writers around the world who have been targets of political persecution.

On March 18, 2003, as part of the tyrant's brutal March 2003 crackdown on peaceful pro-democracy activists, Mr. Arroyo was arrested by Castro's agents of repression. After a sham trial, Mr. Arroyo was sentenced to 26 years in the totalitarian gulag.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Arroyo supports basic human rights for all Cubans. Despite being beaten, harassed, and now, once again, languishing in the grotesque, totalitarian, squalor of Castro's gulag, he is fervently committed to the cause of freedom. My Colleagues, we must demand the immediate release of Victor Rolando Arroyo Carmona and every prisoner of conscience suffering in the totalitarian gulags of the nightmare called the Castro regime.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 4032, THE
VETERANS FIDUCIARY ACT OF 2004

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 2004

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, during the first session of this Congress, the Subcommittee on Benefits of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs held a hearing concerning the Department of Veterans Affairs

(VA) fiduciary program. When a veteran has difficulty managing his own finances, the VA appoints a guardian or a "fiduciary" to oversee his benefits. During the hearing, I was surprised to learn that there is no mechanism in place to provide replacement of benefits for VA beneficiaries whose benefits have been misused by a VA recognized fiduciary.

Unfortunately, some of our veterans have lost out on their VA benefits because of fiduciary misuse. According to an investigation by the Inspector General, one woman embezzled over \$60,000 in VA payments from 1997 to 2001 from a disabled veteran under her care. In another case, a fiduciary defrauded his uncle out of nearly \$55,000 in VA payments.

A good number of our veterans must live on limited budgets and rely primarily on their VA payments. When they lose even a portion of their benefits, the impact on the quality of their lives can be significant.

I was also surprised to learn that Congress has not improved on the safeguards for veterans who depend on fiduciaries in over 25 years. It is time we do something to prevent fraud against our veterans and to provide remedies when benefits are misused.

Today, I am introducing legislation, the "Veterans Fiduciary Act of 2004," which would provide veterans and their families new protections and new avenues to recoup their losses. This bill would require the replacement of benefits in cases when the VA has been negligent in failing to investigate or monitor a fiduciary and in certain other circumstances. It will also require the VA to conduct background checks before recognizing a fiduciary and will give the VA new mechanisms to deter misuse, including civil monetary fines.

Again, I strongly believe we should be doing more to protect the VA benefits our veterans rely upon. I am proud to introduce legislation to give our most vulnerable veterans the protection they deserve.

TRIBUTE TO YEOMAN SECOND CLASS MONTELL L. GWINN

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 2004

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to an outstanding enlisted sailor, Yeoman Second Class, Montell L. Gwinn, as he prepares to complete his service to our Nation in the United States Navy. It is a great honor for me to take this opportunity to thank YN2 Gwinn and his family for his 7 years of distinguished and dedicated service to our Nation for which he has proudly and selflessly served in the defense of freedom.

I came to know this sailor while he was assigned to the Navy's Appropriations Liaison Office. In this capacity, he served as a liaison for me, for the members of my staff, and for the professional staff of the Appropriations Committee I chair to the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations. He also accompanied me on several trips as I investigated the health and welfare of our troops stationed here and throughout the world. In all cases, YN2 Gwinn performed his duties in the most professional manner. He was particularly invaluable in providing great personal insight

as an enlisted sailor, giving tremendous input on issues affecting the sailors and their families. His candor, intelligence, and steadfast devotion to duty, was a tremendous asset to me in my deliberations regarding our most prized commodity within our Armed Forces, the men and women of our all-volunteer force.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize YN2 Gwinn for his distinguished service to our Nation. Montell is symbolic of the spirit of our Nation's all volunteer force. My wife Beverly and I have the highest respect for him and all those who serve in uniform in defense of freedom. Without their dedicated service, we would not be "the land of the free" were we not also the "home of the brave." My colleagues and I want to express our thanks and appreciation for the special contribution YN2 Gwinn has made to the United States Navy and the special insight he has provided me and the members of my Committee. We also wish Montell and his family continued success and the traditional naval wish of "fair winds and following seas" as he closes out his distinguished military career.

RELATING TO THE LIBERATION OF THE IRAQI PEOPLE AND THE VALIANT SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES AND COALITION FORCES

SPEECH OF

HON. DIANA DeGETTE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 2004

Ms. DeGETTE. Mr. Speaker, war does not discriminate on the basis of race, gender, ethnicity or religion—it is indifferent to background or boundaries, social standing or political affiliation. War impacts all of those involved with an impartial voracity. Honoring our men and women for the sacrifice, strength and courage they have demonstrated while in Iraq should be as unbiased—it should not be mired in partisanship or petty politics.

With a unified voice, the House of Representatives should approve a resolution that acknowledges the bravery of the American men and women in Iraq and the sacrifices they and their families have made for the sake of our nation. It should recognize the 575 American soldiers who have lost their lives in Iraq, soldiers who have made the ultimate sacrifice for our country, as well as the more than 3,000 wounded troops who are struggling to recover from their injuries. We are deeply indebted to these men and women and grateful for the hardships they have endured. We should vote on, and unanimously pass, a resolution that unequivocally communicates this.

However, the Republican majority has presented a resolution that specifically and intentionally prevents unanimous support from this body. The divisive language alleging that the world is a safer place after the Iraqi invasion, is not only a point of great contention, it is a distraction from what should be the sole focus of the resolution: to commend our tireless troops in Iraq. Indeed, the Republican majority has squandered the opportunity to send a message of unwavering support to the American men and women in the field, instead opting to politicize the issue in order to advance its own political agenda.

In good faith, I cannot vote for a resolution that asserts that the world is safer since the U.S. invasion of Iraq when by every account, the world is glaringly even more vulnerable, as partly evidenced by the horrific bombing in Madrid last week. When our country chooses to unilaterally use force before exhausting all diplomatic avenues, we risk alienating ourselves from our allies and emboldening our enemies. Unfortunately, I believe our go-it-alone strategy in Iraq has done just that.

While I cannot vote for this resolution, I am steadfast in my support for the American men and women fighting in Iraq and believe we must support them both by word and action. We must fight to get our troops home quickly and safely while upholding the commitment we have made to the Iraqi people. The best possible way to achieve this is by working with the international community to rebuild Iraq. Additionally, we must ensure that our troops, in the field and once they have returned home, have the benefits they rightfully deserve, including increased access to medical care and deserved increases in the family separation allowance and imminent danger pay.

CHILD NUTRITION IMPROVEMENT AND INTEGRITY ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 2004

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my strong support for the Child Nutrition Reauthorization bill, H.R. 3873, which the House approved yesterday. This reauthorization, which only happens every 5 years, provides Congress the opportunity to examine the program, fix problems, and build on past successes. I am greatly disappointed that this year, my colleagues needed to waste valuable energy protecting existing programs from damaging Administration proposals, rather than using what our schools have learned to move forward.

When we started this debate a year ago, President Bush declared that the problem with the nutrition programs was too many children getting lunch. The President imposed burdensome new eligibility verification rules on our local school districts, despite research from his own Department of Agriculture showing his proposal would likely result in a reduction of eligible children participating in the program. I commend my colleagues on the Committee for ensuring that H.R. 3873 does not harm the School Lunch & Breakfast Program, or take food away from children who need it.

I am also pleased that the bill expands pilot programs such as the Luger Summer Food Pilot Program and the Fruit and Vegetable Pilot Program. In the State of Michigan, 11 percent of our children are considered overweight. Children participating in the Fruit and Vegetable Pilot Program not only ate more fruits and vegetables, but actually purchased less high fat vending machine options, had better attention spans in class, and experienced fewer disciplinary problems. This pilot program has shown that, given the resources, schools can create an environment where healthy snack options can be a reality without

limiting choice, and I am pleased that more children will be able to participate.

While H.R. 3873 does not damage the very successful National School Lunch & Breakfast Program, WIC, the Summer Food Service Program, and the Child and Adult Food Program, I believe we missed an important opportunity to help our schools expand their efforts to fight child obesity, which leads to adult diabetes and heart disease. We call on our schools to provide a model of healthy eating habits, but often do not give them the full resources necessary to meet this challenge. Right now, the federal government reimburses schools \$2.14 per free lunch served, \$1.17 per reduced priced lunch, and \$.20 per paid lunch. Our schools struggle to create any meal for only \$2.14, let alone a nutritious one with more expensive fruits and vegetables. If we are to ask our schools to provide healthier lunches, we must provide them with the money to match such a request.

We also missed an opportunity to reduce paperwork and administrative burdens for schools already laden with burdens from No Child Left Behind, by eliminating the reduced price lunch category, and providing all children 185 percent of the poverty line with a free lunch. We should listen to school administrators when they describe the cost of this extra category in staff hours, and children not fed because they can't afford even the low cost of a reduced lunch.

Again, I commend the members of the Committee for protecting the successful child nutrition programs, and I am hopeful that in the future we can listen to our schools needs as they implement these important programs.

INTRODUCTION OF "FINANCIAL LITERACY MONTH"

HON. JUDY BIGGERT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 2004

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a resolution to designate April as "Financial Literacy Month". It is important that we raise public awareness about the importance of financial education in the United States and the serious consequences that may be associated with a lack of understanding about personal finances and economics.

The financial world has dramatically changed over the last 20 years. The passage of complex laws—like Gramm-Leach-Bliley—has created a new world of integrated financial service products and possibilities.

Mr. Speaker, with all these new choices, there is a new responsibility on our part to educate our youth. Why? Because teaching them about personal finance and economics is the best way to prepare them for a financially rewarding adulthood as contributing members of society.

They need to know how to manage money, credit, and debt, and become responsible workers, heads of households, investors, entrepreneurs, business leaders, and citizens. It is through financial education that these young consumers will learn to capitalize on the

choices and flexibility that this new world has created.

The most effective time to impart basic financial and economic knowledge is during students' formative years, through the K–12 education system. In introducing this resolution it is my hope that public officials and educators will focus on this critical learning area.

A survey released in 2003 by the National Council on Economic Education (NCEE) illustrates accomplishments and challenges in the areas of economics and personal finance education. NCEE's 2002 "Survey of the States" found that 48 states and the District of Columbia had economic education standards in place, up from 38 states in NCEE's first "Survey" in 1998. Testing for economics increased from 25 states in 1998 to 27 states in 2002.

However, in the area of personal finance, less progress has been evident. While 40 states had set standards for personal finance education in 2000, only 31 states renewed such standards in 2002. Of those 31 states, only 14 require the standards to be implemented.

As a Member of both the Financial Services Committee and the Education and Workforce Committee, I have come to recognize the importance of integrating financial literacy and basic economics into the K–12 curricula, and the positive impact this can have on millions of future investors. I believe that April should be used to educate all age levels on the importance of financial literacy but most importantly, our youth.

More than 42,000,000 people in the United States currently participate in qualified cash or deferred arrangements known as 401(k) plans. A Retirement Confidence Survey conducted in 2002 found that only 32 percent of workers surveyed have calculated how much money they will need to save for retirement, and 25 percent of workers have done no specific planning for retirement.

Make no mistake—personal finance and economics are the key to helping our youth avoid in later years, as adults, the pitfalls of foreclosure, predatory lending and credit counseling and better prepare them for retirement.

Mr. Speaker, the state of financial illiteracy among our children may not garner much in the way of headlines, but it nonetheless is an issue that should command our attention. It is a problem that is serious and urgent, but it is one that can be solved through education. I would like to call special attention to that need during the month of April. It is our duty to help our youth succeed in today's increasingly sophisticated world of finance.

I want to thank my distinguished colleague and friend from Texas, Mr. HINOJOSA, for his strong support and cosponsorship of this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this bill.

RECOGNIZING SERGEANT DONALD WALTERS

HON. DARLENE HOOLEY

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 2004

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an American hero.

One year ago today, Sergeant Donald Walters bravely offered the ultimate sacrifice in hand-to-hand combat during the now famous ambush of the 507th Army Ordnance Maintenance Company, the same attack in which Pvt. Jessica Lynch was captured.

Sgt. Walters served our nation courageously and honorably long before September 11. He served during the first Gulf War, and returned to raise a family. So if, after the Gulf War, Sgt. Walters decided to never again leave his home and family to defend freedom in a far-away place, he could rest easy because he had already given more than most.

However, after September 11, Sgt. Walters volunteered to rejoin the U.S. Army in order to serve America yet again. He was selfless. He was courageous. He knew what every soldier knows: that great sacrifices would be required in order to serve our nation in its time of need, and he made those sacrifices. I am deeply saddened that, one year ago today, he made the ultimate sacrifice.

Yet his sacrifice, his courage, and his heroism has not and will not be forgotten. Sgt. Donald Walters fought bravely in the ambush on the 507th, and his courage in the face of fire both inflicted damage on the enemy and helped others in his unit to escape the ambush. His gallantry in action has earned him a Silver Star from the Army, a reward much deserved.

The exact chain of events on that fateful day may never be fully revealed. But the family of Sgt. Donald Walters should be assured that the Army, this Congress, and this Nation consider him a hero, and he will never be forgotten.

TRIBUTE TO THE HUNTSVILLE ALUMNAE CHAPTER OF DELTA SIGMA THETA SORORITY

HON. ROBERT E. (BUD) CRAMER, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 2004

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Huntsville Alumnae Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. for fifty years of service in the North Alabama community.

Since its founding on April 24, 1954, the sisters of the Huntsville Alumnae Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. have been an inspiration for young women in our area providing college scholarships and volunteering numerous hours helping others throughout North Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, the Huntsville Alumnae Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta, Inc. is most well known for its annual reception that recognizes and honors outstanding high school teachers and students. In addition, the chapter sponsors an educational and motivational program for young girls called "Girls Empowered to Maximize Self-esteem," or GEMS.

On March 28th, the Huntsville Alumnae Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. will hold its annual Founders' Day program. This year's celebration will be especially memorable and I rise today to join them in their fiftieth commemoration.

IN RECOGNITION OF HANK CARTER ON THE OCCASION OF THE COLER-GOLDWATER SPECIALTY HOSPITAL AND NURSING FACILITY'S NAMING OF THE HANK CARTER REHABILITATION CENTER IN HIS HONOR

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 2004

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Hank Carter, who has single-handedly transformed the Color-Goldwater Specialty Hospital and Nursing Facility's Rehabilitative Medicine Department into one of the best-equipped in the nation. In honor of his remarkable achievements, the hospital has decided to rename the department the "Hank Carter Rehabilitation Center."

New Yorkers are truly fortunate that Henry "Hank" Carter chose to devote his life to raising money for wheelchairs and other equipment for the disabled, but it was a tragedy that led him to that decision. In 1968, his best friend Al Fogle was shot and left paralyzed from the waist down. Mr. Carter stayed with his friend through his recovery and rehabilitation. When he discovered how difficult it was for him to obtain a wheelchair, Mr. Carter raised the money to pay for it. For some, the effort would have ended there. Hank Carter looked around the hospital and saw dozens of other individuals whose lives had been struck by tragedy, and he made it his life's mission to help them.

To the surprise of the hospital administrators and doctors, he asked if the hospital could provide him with a space for his fundraising efforts. Asking nothing in return, he has selflessly raised millions of dollars to help the hospital and its residents. A large portion of the funding comes from the Wheelchair All-Star Basketball Classic he organizes at Madison Square Garden each year featuring top NBA basketball players.

Over the last 30 years, he has made the difference for thousands of people—helping them to become independent, and providing the means for them to connect with the world.

He has helped make Color-Goldwater Hospital one of the premier centers for rehabilitation. Thanks to Hank Carter, Color-Goldwater gives more wheelchairs to patients than any other facility in the country.

Realizing that rehabilitation requires more than wheelchairs, Mr. Carter branched out, raising funds for exercise and physical therapy equipment, computers that can be used by the severely handicapped, technology that enables machines to speak for those who have lost the capacity to communicate, four wheelchair accessible buses and a rehabilitative greenhouse. His enthusiasm and hands-on attitude toward philanthropy make him a beloved fixture at Coler-Goldwater, recognized by every patient and staff member in the hospital. Best of all, he has spent time with them and knows most of them.

It is truly an astonishing record—one all Americans should be very proud of. For the disabled, a wheelchair means independence, selfreliance and the freedom to explore the world. There is nothing more important than giving someone the gift of mobility or giving them back their voice.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to rise to pay tribute to Hank Carter. He is truly an American treasure.

VAISAKHI DAY: GREETINGS TO THE SIKH NATION—COUNCIL OF KHALISTAN ISSUES VAISAKHI MESSAGE TO SIKH NATION

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 2004

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, next month the Sikhs will celebrate one of their most important holidays, Vaisakhi Day. On this day in 1699, Guru Gobind Singh constituted the Sikh Nation. He issued a blessing of sovereignty to the Sikhs, a blessing they are looking to reclaim.

Vaisakhi Day is one of the most important Sikh holidays and there are over 500,000 Sikhs in this country, so I would like to take this opportunity to wish them all a happy Vaisakhi Day. Hopefully, they will use the occasion to work for freedom for their people.

It is an interesting coincidence that Vaisakhi Day happens to fall on the birthday of Thomas Jefferson, author of our Declaration of Independence, who wrote: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it and to institute new government, laying its foundations on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

Mr. Speaker, the Indian government has done everything it can to destroy the safety and happiness of Sikhs, Christians, Muslims, and other minorities living within the country. Is it any wonder that all these groups are seeking their freedom from India's brutal rule?

India has murdered over a quarter of a million Sikhs in the past 20 years. It holds over 52,000 of them as political prisoners. More than 300,000 Christians in Nagaland have been murdered by the Indian government, and Christians seem to be targets everywhere else in India too. India has killed over 85,000 Kashmiri Muslims since 1988, and that doesn't count the thousands who have been killed in places like Gujarat.

Yet India continues to proclaim loudly that it is a democracy. As Jefferson noted, the central principle of a democratic state is "the consent of the governed." How can India claim to have the consent of the minorities it governs so brutally while killing tens of thousands of them? It doesn't make sense to me. The essence of democracy is the right to self-determination.

We must do what we can, Mr. Speaker, as a country dedicated to the principle of liberty. We should stop U.S. aid to India until it respects human rights and we should use whatever influence we can to get India to hold a free and fair plebiscite on the question of independence, under international observation.

The Council of Khalistan has issued a very informative letter in honor of Vaisakhi Day, which contains a lot of useful information about the occasion and the atrocities that have been committed by India against the Sikhs and others. Therefore, I would like to put it in the RECORD now, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

VAISAKHI DAY MESSAGE TO THE SIKH NATION:

(By Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh)

In 1699 on Vaisakhi Day, 305 years ago, Guru Gobind Singh established the Khalsa Panth. The Guru granted sovereignty to the Sikh Nation, saying "In Grieb Sikhin Ko Deon Patshahi." It is this spirit instilled in the Sikh Nation by Guru Gobind Singh that led them to fight tyrants like lions until they defeated them. We always remember it by reciting every morning and evening, "Raj Kare Ga Khalsa." Now is the time to act on it. Do we mean what we say every morning and evening?

Punjab is the gateway to India. Many invaders have come from the West—the Moguls, the Afghans, and others—to conquer and established their rule in Delhi. Sikhs saw this unprecedented persecution at the hands of invaders and rulers. Banda Singh Bahadur established the first Khalsa Raj in Punjab in 1710, lasting until 1716. Then the Sikh missals again established their rule in the various regions of Punjab in 1765. Maharajah Ranjit Singh established Sikh Raj with Lahore as its capital in 1799, 100 years after the initiation of the Khalsa Panth. Sikhs ruled Punjab under Maharajah Ranjit Singh in the true Sikh tradition, the well being of everybody (Sarbat Da Bhalah). Hindus, Muslims, and Christians were all part of the Sikh government. The Sikh army included Hindus, Muslims, and Christians. A Christian, General Ventura, was in charge of the infantry. The period from 1799 to 1839, when Maharajah Ranjit Singh died, was the Golden Age of Punjab. The sovereign Sikh state of Punjab was recognized by China, Russia, and the European countries. It was the dominant power in South Asia at that time. Sikhs conquered Kashmir from Afghanistan in 1819, making it part of Punjab.

The British conquered us in 1849 with the help of their planted agents the Hindu Dogra brothers, Pahara Singh, etc., who connived with the British and betrayed the Sikh Nation. As a reward to the Dogra brothers for their betrayal, the British sold them Kashmir for Rs400,000. At the time of independence in 1947, the Sikh leadership was fooled into taking their share with India by the dishonest Hindu leaders Nehru and Gandhi, while the Muslims got their own sovereign country, Pakistan. Nehru and Gandhi promised that Sikhs would have the glow of freedom in Punjab, but instead we got unprecedented persecution at the hands of the Indian government. In June 1984 they attacked the Golden Temple and 127 other Gurdwaras throughout Punjab. Over 20,000 Sikhs were murdered in those attacks, known as Operation Bluestar, including Sant Jarnail Singh Bhindranwale, General Shabeg Singh, Bhai Amrik Singh, and over 100 Sikh religious students ages 8-13 who were taken out into the courtyard and shot. If Sikhs cannot protect the sanctity of the Golden Temple, then the Sikh Nation cannot survive as a nation.

The Golden Temple attacks set off a wave of repression and genocide that resulted in the murder of over 250,000 Sikhs at the hands of the Indian government. Over 50,000 Sikh youth were picked up from their houses, tortured, murdered in police custody, then cremated by being declared "unidentified bodies." Their remains were never even given to their families! Over 52,000 Sikhs sit in Indian jails as political prisoners without charge or trial, many since 1984.

Repression and genocide of this magnitude at the hands of the Indian government is unparalleled in the late part of the 20th century. India should be ashamed of the genocide it has committed against Sikhs, Christians, Muslims, and other minorities. Khalsa Ji, at this time of Vaisakhi, the whole Khalsa Panth must be energized to reestablish a sovereign, independent Khalsa Raj by freeing our homeland, Khalistan.

India is not one nation. It is a polyglot empire thrown together under one roof for the administrative convenience of the British colonialists. It has 18 official languages. History shows that such countries are doomed to fall apart. India will collapse just like the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the Soviet Union, and other multinational states such as Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia. The cracks are appearing and India is crumbling. The clock is ticking. The Kashmir issue has been internationalized. The United States is now involved in the issue. On December 5, President Bush told me "I am aware of the Sikh and Kashmiri problem." There will be a referendum in Kashmir under international supervision. Kashmir will either be independent or become part of Pakistan. It will not remain within India. As L.K. Advani predicted, "When Kashmir goes, India goes." This time we agree with Mr. Advani. Kashmir will go and India will disintegrate.

Khalsa Ji, bring back your Khalsa spirit. Look at Advani having a yatra of India and coming to Amritsar. Punjab belongs to the Khalsa Panth, not to India. He has no right to show Hindu dominance in Punjab. Shame on the Akali leaders like Badal, Tohra, and others who have joined hands with the BJP, which is the political arm of the RSS. We need a new Sikh political party which has a dedication to the interests of the Sikh Nation as its sole objective, to establish Khalsa Raj by liberating Khalistan, severing all political ties with India. If the BJP wants Hindu Raj, it cannot object to Khalsa Raj.

The Sikhs in Punjab have suffered enormous repression at the hands of the Indian regime in the last 20 years. The Indian government wants to break the will of the Sikh Nation and enslave them forever, making Sikhism a part of Hinduism. This can only be stopped if we free Punjab from Delhi's control and reestablish a sovereign, independent country, as declared on October 7, 1957. Then Punjab will be a member of the United Nations and we will have Ambassadors in almost 200 countries.

Khalsa Ji, remember that a free Khalistan will bring economic prosperity to Punjab farmers. They will be able to sell their produce internationally which will fetch them much higher prices than they are getting now from the Indian government. The Indian government fixes prices of produce so low that farmers get deeper and deeper in debt while they sell fertilizer, seeds, and insecticides to the farmers at artificially high prices. The Indian government has diverted Punjab river water to neighboring states without any compensation to Punjab. Punjab farmers are forced to pump subsoil water for irrigation. This is expensive and brings salinity to soil, which lowers the crop production.

Remember, 3 million (30 lakh) Sikhs live outside India. The outside Sikhs are free, prosperous, well educated, professional, and committed to establishing an independent, sovereign Khalistan. The Indian government does not have any control over the Sikh diaspora. Outside Sikhs have exposed the atrocities committed on the Sikhs by the Indian government. Outside Sikhs have also preserved the true history of the Sikhs since 1984 by documenting every incident in the U.S. Congressional Record while the Indian government tries to alter Sikh history. Out-

side Sikhs are committed to a continuing effort to free Khalistan. Remember the words of Professor Darshan Singh, former Jathedar of the Akal Takht, during the celebration of Guru Nanak's birthday: "If a Sikh is not a Khalistani, he is not a Sikh." He was only reiterating the Guru's blessing, "In Grief Sikhin Ko Deon Patshahi." The time to achieve our independence is now.

Khalsa Ji, remain in Charhdi Kala. Always remember our heritage: Raj Kare Ga Khalsa; Khalsa Bagi Yan Badshah. Freedom for Khalistan is very close.

RECOGNIZING LIEUTENANT FRANCIS R. BASON

HON. JIM GERLACH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 2004

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lieutenant Francis R. Bason for his 14 years of service with the Montgomery County, Pennsylvania District Attorney's Detective Bureau.

Lieutenant Francis Bason has been employed by Montgomery County since July 9, 1990 as Supervisor of the Narcotics Enforcement Team. He has served a total of 42 years in law enforcement; 14 with Montgomery County and 28 years with the Pennsylvania State Police.

In 1958, Francis Bason began his proud service in the United States Army Dental Corps before being honorably discharged in 1961. He returned to Pennsylvania and started his career in law enforcement as a traffic officer. In 1965, he became part of the State Police's Criminal Intelligence Unit, Youth Aid Division, headquartered in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. In 1971, Frank was promoted to Corporal and assigned to the Patrol Division that he ultimately supervised. That same year, he became the Pennsylvania State Police's, Drug Law Enforcement Division Regional Supervisor where he was the director of undercover operations for a six-county area in South-eastern Pennsylvania.

During his years with the Pennsylvania State Police, Francis Bason continued his education and, in 1977, graduated magna cum laude from West Chester State University with a bachelor of science degree. Two years later, he received his master in science degree from West Chester as well.

In 1990, Frank became a Narcotics Enforcement Detective for the Montgomery County District Attorney's office, in March of 1993, he was promoted to Detective-In-Charge of the Narcotics Enforcement Team. One year later, he was promoted to Lieutenant.

Over the years, Lieutenant Francis Bason has been recognized by his peers, both locally and nationally, for his tremendous achievements in law enforcement. In 1982, he received the Award for Exceptional Service from the Federal Drug Enforcement Administration. In 1988, he was recognized as the Outstanding Police Officer of the Year by the Pennsylvania State Police and, one year later, received the Pennsylvania State Police Commendation Medal. His tremendous knowledge and experience was also recognized by the United States Congress in 1980 when he was asked to testify before the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control on various drug-trafficking and law enforcement issues.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me today in recognizing Lieutenant Francis R. Bason for his many years of exemplary service to his community, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and our nation.

CONGRATULATING WILMINGTON COLLEGE LADY QUAKERS BASKETBALL TEAM

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 2004

Mr. TURNER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today congratulations are in order for the Wilmington (OH) College Lady Quakers Basketball team. Last Saturday, March 20, 2004, the Lady Quakers won the NCAA Division III national championship by defeating the previously unbeaten, and top-ranked, Bowdoin College Lady Polar Bears, 59-53.

Special congratulations to the Lady Quakers' Tara Rausch who was selected Final Four MVP as well as first team All-American; Amy Kincer who was named to the all-tournament team; and Wilmington head coach, Jerry Scheve, on the team's 27-6, championship season.

The Wilmington College Lady Quakers' NCAA Division III 2004 national basketball championship is a testament to the team's commitment to excellence, upholding the best traditions of this country's true scholar-athletes.

I ask my colleagues as well as all citizens of the Ohio Valley to join me in congratulating the faculty, staff, parents and friends of Wilmington College on completing an exciting and memorable championship season.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JOHNNETTA COLE

HON. ROBERT E. (BUD) CRAMER, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 2004

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Johnnetta Cole for her many accomplishments in higher education and leadership in her community.

Dr. Johnnetta Cole is the President of Bennett College, a Historically Black Women's College in Greensboro, North Carolina. She is also a Professor Emerita at Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia, and was the first female President of Spelman College, also in Atlanta, Georgia.

In addition, Dr. Cole served her Nation proudly in 1992 when President-elect Bill Clinton appointed her as his transition coordinator for education, arts, labor, and humanities.

Mr. Speaker, on March 28th, Dr. Cole will be the Keynote Speaker at the Founders' Day program for the Huntsville Alumnae Chapter of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc. I rise today to welcome her to North Alabama and to honor her achievements in advancing higher education throughout our country.

THE JEWISH MUSEUM CELEBRATES 100 YEARS OF CULTURAL EDUCATION

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 2004

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to The Jewish Museum on the occasion of its centennial celebration. The Museum, located in the heart of New York City's Museum Mile, is the foremost American institution devoted to the exploration of Jewish art and culture. For one hundred years this museum has been a source of inspiration and education to New Yorkers and visitors from around the world.

The Jewish Museum—the first institution of its kind in the United States—began in 1904, when Judge Mayer Sulzberger donated 26 Jewish ceremonial art objects to the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. Since then, the Museum's collection has grown to encompass more than 28,000 artifacts, including paintings, sculpture, photographs, archaeological finds, ceremonial objects, audiovisual materials and broadcast media. The museum sponsors a variety of special exhibitions, such as the recent *Entertaining America: Jews, Movies and Broadcasting*. Its permanent collection, *Culture and Continuity: The Jewish Journey*, has received international acclaim.

Piecing together an accurate representation of Jewish cultural history is a daunting task. In the last four thousand years, Jews have created communities in nearly every part of the world—and each of these communities has made a unique contribution to the Jewish experience. Through its exhibitions and collection, the Jewish Museum presents a narrative that spans millennia. That the Museum manages to tell this story in such a compelling and informative way is testament to the vision of the Museum's stewards, from Judge Sulzberger one hundred years ago to the institution's current Director, Ms. Joan Rosenbaum.

In addition to presenting the cultural history of the Jewish people, the Museum also sponsors groundbreaking exhibitions that greatly influence both the art world and our community as a whole. In 1966, the Museum's Primary Structures show defined the Minimalist art movement and introduced to a wide audience the works of Dan Flavin, Donald Judd and other major exemplars of the style. In 1970, the Museum reaffirmed its position on the leading edge of the art community when it presented *Software*, a pioneering exhibition of interactive, information technology-related art. Additionally, the Museum was among the first to exhibit the works of Jasper Johns and Robert Rauschenberg; other prominent artists, such as Marc Chagall, Wassily Kandinsky, and Camille Pissarro have also been featured by the Museum. The upcoming Modigliani show is expected to draw crowds to the first major exhibition of his work in New York since 1951.

The Jewish Museum strikes a perfect balance between beliefs that, in our world, too often compete with one another. Indeed, while the Museum celebrates Jewish culture and encourages the appreciation of the past, it also

promotes tolerance for alternative points of view and seeks to nurture emerging trends. America, at its best, is likewise a harmony of different people and ideas; in fact, it is precisely this quality that makes our nation the greatest in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I request that my colleagues join me in paying tribute to The Jewish Museum, whose century of incomparable, path-breaking achievements are truly worthy of celebration.

400TH ANNIVERSARY OF GURU GRANTH SAHIB, SIKH HOLY SCRIPTURES

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 2004

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, on August 14, there will be a parade in Washington, DC to celebrate the 400th anniversary of the compilation of the Guru Granth Sahib, the holy scripture of the Sikh religion. It was the revelation of the Sikh Gurus and it is the basis for the Sikh religion and way of life.

In June 1984, during India's military assault on the Sikhs at their most sacred shrine, the Golden Temple in Amritsar, and 125 other Gurdwaras throughout Punjab, an original of the Guru Granth Sahib was riddled with bullet holes by Indian forces. This was a gratuitous insult to the Sikh people and a coordinated denigration of their religion. It made it clear to them that there is no place for them in supposedly democratic, supposedly secular India.

This will be a major celebration for the Sikh people, over half a million of whom live here in America. They are productive, committed citizens who contribute to every walk of American life and who share a commitment to bring the freedom they enjoy to their brothers and sisters back home in Punjab, Khalistan.

There was even a Sikh who served in Congress, Dalip Singh Saund.

In addition to the August 14 parade, there will also be a seminar here in Washington on June 5 to commemorate this momentous occasion.

Mr. Speaker, we are a diverse country. Our strength has always been the ability to preserve our individuality and diversity while creating a unified society. In that spirit, I would like to take this opportunity to honor the Sikhs of America and worldwide on the 400th anniversary of the Guru Granth Sahib.

Mr. Speaker, the Council of Khalistan published an excellent press release about the events that are coming up to celebrate this event, which I would like to place in the RECORD at this time.

400TH ANNIVERSARY OF GURU GRANTH SAHIB—REMEMBER BULLETS PIERCED THROUGH GURU GRANTH SAHIB IN 1984

RESERVE SATURDAY, AUGUST 14, 2004 FOR A MEMORABLE CELEBRATION, PARADE IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

WASHINGTON, D.C., March 24, 2004.—On August 14, Sikh from around the East Coast will observe the 400th anniversary of the compilation of the Guru Granth Sahib, the Sikh holy scriptures. There will be a parade in Washington, D.C. to mark the occasion.

The Guru Granth Sahib was dictated by the Sikh Gurus as revealed to them by God. It was written at the time in which they lived. It also includes the writing of other saints of that time which fit the philosophy of the Sikh Gurus.

In addition, there will be a seminar on Saturday, June 5 to celebrate the 400th anniversary of the Guru Granth Sahib sponsored by the International Conference on Sikh Studies along with Sikh Gurdwara and institutions of North America. Sikhs remember that bullets pierced through the Guru Granth Sahib during Operation Bluestar, the Indian government's military attack on the Golden Temple in Amritsar, in 1984.

"This parade and this anniversary will be a joyous occasion for the Sikh Nation as we celebrate the Sikh way of life as given to us by the Gurus," said Dr. Gurmit Singh Aulakh, President of the Council of Khalistan. Sikhism is an independent, monotheistic religion that believes in the equality of the whole human race. The tenth and last Sikh Guru, Guru Gobind Singh, declared the blessing "In Grieb Sikhin Ko Deon Patshahi," conferring sovereignty on the Sikh Nation, which is culturally, linguistically, and religiously distinct from any other people in the world, including Hindu India. "We must honor the Guru by reclaiming our lost sovereignty," Dr. Aulakh said.

The Indian government has murdered over 250,000 Sikhs since 1984, more than 300,000 Christians since 1948, over 85,000 Muslims in Kashmir since 1988, and tens of thousands of Tamils, Assamese, Manipuris, Dalits, and others. The Indian Supreme Court called the Indian government's murders of Sikhs "worse than a genocide." According to a study by the Movement Against State Repression, 52,268 Sikhs are being held in illegal detention as political prisoners without charge or trial. Some of them have been held since 1984!

Christian missionary Joseph Cooper was expelled from India after a mob of militant Hindu nationalists allied with the Rashtriya Swayamsewak Sangh (RSS), a pro-Fascist organization that is the parent organization of the ruling BJP, beat him so severely he had to spend a week in the hospital. In 2002, 2,000 to 5,000 Muslims were murdered in Gujarat while police were ordered to stand aside, reminiscent of the 1984 Delhi massacres of Sikhs. Indian newspapers reported that the government planned the Gujarat massacre in advance.

India is not one country; it is a polyglot thrown together by the British for their administrative convenience. Sikhs ruled Punjab until 1849 when the British conquered the subcontinent. Sikhs were equal partners during the transfer of power from the British. The Muslim leader Jinnah got Pakistan, the Hindu leaders got India, but the Sikh leadership was fooled by the Hindu leadership promising that Sikhs would have "the glow of freedom" in Northwest India. The Sikhs took their share with India on that promise. For that mistake, Sikhs are suffering now. "As Professor Darshan Singh, a former Jathedar of the Akal Takht, said, 'If a Sikh is not for Khalistan, he is not a Sikh,'" Dr. Aulakh noted.

"Democracies don't commit genocide," Dr. Aulakh said. "Only in a free and sovereign Khalistan will the Sikh Nation prosper. In a democracy, the right to self-determination is the sine qua non and India should allow a plebiscite for the freedom of the Sikh Nation," he said. "The Guru Granth Sahib is the reigning Guru of the Sikh Nation and reminds us of our heritage and we must offer a fitting celebration," he said.

MICROSOFT EU DECISION

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 2004

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I'm from Seattle and I have a good neighbor named Microsoft.

A while back, they got out of line. The European Union said so. Microsoft said so.

Both sides have been negotiating to reach a just and fair settlement. It looked like good faith negotiations would lead to a common good solution. But, the decision issued by the EU falls short in my judgment.

At best, the EU leaves the matter unresolved with more legal action a certainty. At worst, consumers across Europe face confusion, and perhaps even fewer choices than anyone intended in a settlement. We can do better. The EU should find a way to re-visit its decision.

On the horizon are extraordinary new ideas and they will have their own challenges. We have to confront and settle the past. Fairly, yes. Fully, yes. Finally, yes. This is an opportunity to do just that. I hope the EU takes it. Thank you.

THE UNITED MEN OF PIKE FOR
PROGRESS**HON. MAC COLLINS**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 2004

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize a very special organization in Pike County, Georgia. The United Men of Pike for Progress was founded in Zebulon, Georgia by six men who had a vision for Pike County—a vision of a better community. Today, this non-profit organization is bringing that vision to

reality through its dedication to promoting education, leadership, and strong values.

The United Men of Pike for Progress has made its mark in Pike County. They have provided over 600 food baskets and other funds for seniors and needy families throughout the community. Each year they sponsor programs in honor of Dr. Martin Luther King Day that bring the entire community together. For students, they have provided more than eighteen collegiate scholarships to high school seniors, they continually support Junior High School students by donating funds for field trips, and they have raised critical funds for numerous sports oriented High School Clubs.

The United Men of Pike for Progress plays an important role in advancing the quality of life for so many Georgians through its programs, services and outreach and will have a great impact upon the community for many years to come. I honor them for all that they do.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3199–S3218

Measures Introduced: Five bills were introduced, as follows: S. 2241–2245. **Page S3214**

Measures Passed:

School Lunch and Child Nutrition Programs Authorization: Senate passed S. 2241, to reauthorize certain school lunch and child nutrition programs through June 30, 2004. **Page S3217**

Welfare Reauthorization Bill—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at 1 p.m., on Monday, March 29, 2004, Senate will begin consideration of H.R. 4, to reauthorize and improve the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families, and improve access to quality child care. **Page S3217**

Executive Reports of Committees: Senate received the following executive report of a committee:

Report to accompany the Protocol Additional to the Agreement Between the United States of America and the International Atomic Energy Agency for the Application of Safeguards in the United States of America, with annexes, signed at Vienna, June 12, 1998 (Treaty Doc. 107–7) (Ex. Rept. 108–12)

Pages S3213–14

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Michele J. Sison, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the United Arab Emirates.

Thomas Charles Krajeski, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Yemen. **Page S3218**

Measures Placed on Calendar: **Page S3212**

Executive Communications: **Pages S3212–13**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S3213–14**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page S3214**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S3214–16**

Additional Statements: **Pages S3210–12**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m., and adjourned at 12:07 p.m., until 1 p.m., on Monday, March 29, 2004. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on pages S3217–18.)

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

The House was not in session today. The House will meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday, March 29, for Morning Hour debate and at 2 p.m. for legislative business.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRAM AHEAD

Week of March 29 through April 3, 2004

Senate Chamber

On *Monday*, at 1 p.m., Senate will begin consideration of H.R. 4, Welfare Reform Reauthorization.

During the balance of the week, Senate may consider any other cleared legislative and executive business.

Senate Committees

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Committee on Appropriations: March 30, Subcommittee on District of Columbia, to hold hearings to examine the deficiencies at the District of Columbia's Youth Services Administration, 9:30 a.m., SD-192.

March 30, Subcommittee on Military Construction, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2005 for Defense-wide and Air Force military construction programs, 10 a.m., SD-138.

March 30, Subcommittee on Homeland Security, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2005 for border security and enforcement and immigration services, 10 a.m., SD-124.

March 31, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2005 for the Department of Energy's Office of Environmental Management, Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management, and Office of Environment, Safety and Health, 10 a.m., SD-138.

March 31, Subcommittee on Defense, to hold a closed hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2005 for intelligence and world wide threat assessment, 10 a.m., S-407, Capitol.

March 31, Subcommittee on Legislative Branch, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2005 for the Senate Sergeant at Arms and the United States Capitol Police, 2 p.m., SD-138.

March 31, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2005 for HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention programs, 2:30 p.m., SD-124.

April 1, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, to hold hearings to examine pro-

posed budget estimates for fiscal year 2005 for the National Institutes of Health, 9:30 a.m., SH-216.

April 1, Subcommittee on Interior, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2005 for the Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services, 9:30 a.m., SD-124.

April 1, Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2005 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, 10 a.m., SD-628.

April 1, Subcommittee on Transportation, to hold hearings to examine future challenges facing the United States Postal Service, 10 a.m., SD-138.

April 1, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2005 for programs under its jurisdiction, 1:30 p.m., SD-192.

Committee on Armed Services: March 29, Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, to hold a closed briefing on defense science and technology programs and capabilities, 3 p.m., S-407, Capitol.

March 30, Full Committee, to hold closed hearings to examine the second interim report of the Iraq Survey Group, 9:30 a.m., S-407, Capitol.

March 30, Subcommittee on Airland, to hold hearings to examine the proposed Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2005 and the Future Years Defense Program, focusing on Army aviation programs, 2 p.m., SR-232A.

March 30, Full Committee, to receive a closed briefing on operations and intelligence, 4:30 p.m., SR-222.

March 31, Subcommittee on Personnel, to hold hearings to examine the Defense authorization request for fiscal year 2005, focusing on active and Reserve military and civilian personnel programs, 9:30 a.m., SR-232A.

April 1, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the proposed Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2005, focusing on the military strategy and operational requirements of the unified and regional commands; to be followed by a possible closed session in SR-222, 9:30 a.m., SD-106.

April 1, Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support, to hold hearings to examine the proposed Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2005, focusing on military installation programs, 2:30 p.m., SR-232A.

April 2, Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2005 for the Department of Defense Counternarcotics Program in review of the Defense Authorization Request, 9:30 a.m., SR-222.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: March 30, business meeting to consider the nomination of Alphonso R. Jackson, of Texas, to be Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and an original bill, entitled The Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2004, 2 p.m., SD-538.

March 31, Full Committee, to resume hearings to examine the current investigations and regulatory actions

regarding the mutual fund industry focusing on soft-dollar practices, 10 a.m., SD-538.

March 31, Full Committee, to continue hearings to examine the current investigations and regulatory actions regarding the mutual fund industry focusing on fund costs and distribution practices, 2:30 p.m., SD-538.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: March 30, Subcommittee on Aviation, to hold closed hearings to examine aviation security, 9:30 a.m., SR-253.

March 30, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Theodore William Kassinger, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of Commerce, Deborah Hersman, of Virginia, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board, Thomas Hill Moore, of Florida, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, A. Paul Anderson, of Florida, and Joseph E. Brennan, of Maine, both to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner, and Jack Edwin McGregor, of Connecticut, to be a Member of the Advisory Board of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, 2:30 p.m., SR-253.

April 1, Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Space, to hold hearings to examine NASA fiscal year 2005 budget request, 2:30 p.m., SR-253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: March 30, to hold hearings to examine the implementation of the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000, 10 a.m., SD-366.

March 30, Subcommittee on National Parks, to hold oversight hearings to examine National Heritage Areas, including findings and recommendations of the General Accounting Office, the definition of a National Heritage Area, the definition of national significance as it relates to National Heritage Areas, recommendations for establishing National Heritage Areas as units of the National Park System, recommendations for prioritizing proposed studies and designations, and options for developing a National Heritage Area Program within the National Park Service, 2:30 p.m., SD-366.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: March 31, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Stephen L. Johnson, of Maryland, to be Deputy Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, Ann R. Klee, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator, Charles Johnson, of Utah, to be Chief Financial Officer, Benjamin Grumbles, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator, all of the Environmental Protection Agency, and Gary Lee Visscher, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board, 9:30 a.m., SD-406.

March 31, Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure, to hold hearings to examine the role of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in meeting the nation's water resource needs in the 21st century, 1:30 p.m., SD-406.

April 1, Subcommittee on Clean Air, Climate Change, and Nuclear Safety, to hold an oversight hearing to examine the implementation of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for particulate matter and ozone, 9:30 a.m., SD-406.

Committee on Foreign Relations: March 30, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of John J. Danilovich, of California, to be Ambassador to Brazil, and Craig A. Kelly, of California, to be Ambassador to Chile, 10 a.m., SD-419.

March 31, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Paul V. Applegarth, of Connecticut, to be Chief Executive Officer, Millennium Challenge Corporation, Department of State, 9:30 a.m., SD-419.

March 31, Subcommittee on European Affairs, to hold hearings to examine the effects of the Madrid Terrorist Attacks on U.S.-European cooperation in the war on terrorism, 2:30 p.m., SD-1419.

April 1, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine Convention on International Interests in Mobile Equipment and Protocol to Convention on International Interests in Mobile Equipment on Matters Specific to Aircraft Equipment, concluded at Cape Town, South Africa, on November 16, 2001 (Treaty Doc. 108-10), Additional Protocol Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Romania Concerning the Reciprocal Encouragement and Protection of Investment of May 28, 1992, signed at Brussels on September 22, 2003 (Treaty Doc. 108-13), Additional Protocol Between the United States of America and the Republic of Bulgaria Amending the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Republic of Bulgaria Concerning the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investment of September 23, 1992, signed at Brussels on September 22, 2003 (Treaty Doc. 108-15), Protocol Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Estonia to the Treaty for the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investment of April 19, 1994, signed at Brussels on October 24, 2003 (Treaty Doc. 108-17), Additional Protocol Between the United States of America and the Czech Republic to the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic Concerning the Reciprocal Encouragement and Protection of Investment of October 22, 1991, signed at Brussels on December 10, 2003 (Treaty Doc. 108-18), Additional Protocol Between the United States of America and the Slovak Republic to the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic Concerning the Reciprocal Encouragement and Protection of Investment of October 22, 1991, signed at Brussels on September 22, 2003 (Treaty Doc. 108-19), Additional Protocol Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Latvia to the Treaty for the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investment of January 13, 1995, signed at Brussels on September 22, 2003 (Treaty Doc. 108-20), Additional Protocol Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Lithuania to the Treaty for the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investment of January 14, 1998, signed at Brussels on September 22, 2003 (Treaty Doc. 108-21), and Additional Protocol Between the United States of America and the Republic of Poland to the Treaty Between the United States of America and the

Republic of Poland Concerning Business and Economic Relations of March 21, 1990, signed at Brussels on January 12, 2004 (Treaty Doc.108-22), 9:30 a.m., SD-419.

Committee on Governmental Affairs: March 30, Financial Management, the Budget, and International Security, to hold hearings to examine the Federal government's role in empowering Americans to make informed financial decisions, 2:30 p.m., SD-342.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: March 31, business meeting to consider pending nominations, 10 a.m., SD-430.

Committee on Indian Affairs: March 30, to hold oversight hearings to examine Inter-Tribal Timber Council's Indian Forest Management Assessment Team report, 9 a.m., SR-485.

March 30, Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine S. 868, to amend the Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Restoration Act to provide for the cultural restoration and economic self-sufficiency of the Confederation Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians of Oregon, 10 a.m., SR-485.

Committee on the Judiciary: April 1, Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security and Citizenship, to hold hearings to examine securing our borders under a temporary guest worker program, 2:30 p.m., SD-226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: March 30, to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH-219.

March 31, Full Committee, closed business meeting to consider pending intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH-219.

House Chamber

Program to be announced.

House Committees

Committee on Appropriations, March 30, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, Judiciary and Related Agencies, on NOAA, 10 a.m., and on Members of Congress, 2 p.m., H-309 Capitol.

March 30, Subcommittee on Defense, on U.S. Air Force, 10 a.m., 2212 Rayburn and executive, on U.S. Air Force Acquisition, 1:30 p.m., H-140 Capitol.

March 30, Subcommittee on Homeland Security, on Science and Technology, 10 a.m., 2362A Rayburn.

March 30, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies, to continue appropriation hearings, 10 a.m., 2358 Rayburn.

March 31, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, Judiciary and Related Agencies on FCC, 10 a.m., and on SEC, 2 p.m., H-309 Capitol.

March 31, Subcommittee on Defense, executive, on Missile Defense, 10 a.m., H-140 Capitol.

March 31, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, on Contributions of the Army Corps of Engineers in the Restoration of Iraq and Afghanistan, 9:30 a.m., 2362B Rayburn.

March 31, Subcommittee on Homeland Security, on U.S. Coast Guard, 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

March 31, Subcommittee on Interior, on Smithsonian, 10 a.m., B-308 Rayburn.

March 31, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies, on Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 10:15 a.m., 2358 Rayburn.

March 31, Subcommittee on Military Construction, on Pacific Command, 1:30 p.m., B-300 Rayburn.

March 31, Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies, on Department of Veterans Affairs, 10 a.m., and 1 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

April 1, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, Judiciary and Related Agencies, on Broadcasting Board of Governors, 10 a.m., and on International Organizations, 2 p.m., H-309 Capitol.

April 1, Subcommittee on District of Columbia, on Public Defender Services; Court Services, and Offender Supervision, 10 a.m., 2362A Rayburn.

April 1, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, on U.S. Agency for International Development, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

April 1, Subcommittee on Homeland Security, on Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection, 10 a.m., 2362B Rayburn.

April 1, Subcommittee on Interior, on National Endowment for the Arts, 10 a.m., and on National Endowment for the Humanities, 11 a.m., B-308 Rayburn.

April 1, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies, on Workforce Preparation and Training, 10 a.m., 2358 Rayburn.

April 1, Subcommittee on Transportation, Treasury, Independent Agencies, on Executive Office of the President, 10 a.m., 2358 Rayburn.

April 1, Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies, on NSF, 2 p.m., 2358 Rayburn.

April 2, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, Judiciary and Related Agencies, on Legal Services Corporation, 10 a.m., H-309 Capitol.

Committee on Armed Services, March 30, Subcommittee on Projection Forces, hearing on Navy Force Structure and Ship Construction, 1 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

March 30, Subcommittee on Readiness, hearing on Logistics: Lessons from OPERATION IRAQI FREEDOM and Logistics Transformation, 2 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

March 31, full Committee, hearing on the Fiscal Year 2005 National Defense Authorization budget request of the Department of Defense, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

March 31, Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities, hearing on the Fiscal Year 2005 National Defense Authorization budget request—Department of Defense's Business Transformation Efforts, 1:30 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

March 31, Subcommittee on Total Force, hearing on the Fiscal Year 2005 National Defense Authorization budget request on Reserve Component Transformation and Relieving the Stress on the Reserve Component, 1 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

April 1, Subcommittee on Tactical Air and Land Forces, hearing on the Fiscal Year 2005 National Defense Authorization budget request—Future Combat System and Force Protection Initiatives, 1 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

April 1, Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities, hearing on the Fiscal Year 2005

National Defense Authorization budget request—Destructions of the U.S. Chemical Weapons Stockpile—Program and Status, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, March 31, Subcommittee on Commerce, Trade, and Consumer Protection, hearing entitled “U.S.-China Trade: Preparations for the Joint Commission on Commerce and Trade,” 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

March 31, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled “A Review to Assess Progress with the Bureau of Customs and Border Protection’s Targeting Program for Sea Cargo,” 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

April 1, full Committee, hearing entitled “FY 2005 Budget Priorities for the Department of Energy,” 9:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

April 1, Subcommittee on Health, to continue hearings entitled “Inter-governmental Transfers: Violations of the Federal-State Medicaid Partnership or Legitimate State Budget Tool?” 2322 Rayburn.

April 1, Subcommittee on Telecommunications and the Internet, hearing entitled Legislative Hearing on the Reauthorization of the Satellite Home Viewer Improvement Act, 2 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, March 30, Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit and the Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity, joint hearing entitled “Subprime Lending: Defining the Market and Its Customers,” 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

March 31, Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Insurance, and Government Sponsored Enterprises, hearing entitled “Working with State Regulators to Increase Insurance Choices for Consumers,” 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

April 1, full Committee, hearing entitled “Oversight of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency,” 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, March 30, Subcommittee on Civil Service and Agency Organization, hearing entitled “A System Rued: Inspecting Food,” 3 p.m., 2203 Rayburn.

March 30, Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, hearing entitled “Measuring the Effectiveness of Drug Addiction Treatment,” 2 p.m., 2247 Rayburn.

March 30, Subcommittee on National Security, Emerging Threats and International Relations, hearing entitled “Does the ‘Total Force’ Add Up? The Impact of Health Protection Programs on Guard and Reserve Units,” 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

March 30, Subcommittee on Technology, Information Policy, Intergovernmental Relations and the Census, hearing entitled “Telecommunication and SCADA: Secure Links or Open Portals to the Security of the Nation’s Critical Infrastructure,” 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

March 31, Subcommittee on Government Efficiency and Financial Management, oversight hearing entitled “10 Years of GPRA—Results, Demonstrated,” 2 p.m., 2247 Rayburn.

April 1, Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, hearing entitled “Marijuana and Medicine: The Need For a Science-Based Approach,” 2 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on International Relations, March 30, hearing on the Bush Administration and Nonproliferation: A New Strategy Emerges, 11 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

March 31, to mark up the following: H.R. 3978, Designation of Foreign Terrorist Organizations Reform Act; the North Korea Human Rights Act of 2004; H.R. 2760, Resolution of the Ethiopia-Eritrea Border Dispute Act of 2003; H. Res. 402, Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the urgent need for freedom, democratic reform, and international monitoring of elections, human rights, and religious liberty in the Lao People’s Democratic Republic; H. Res. 563, Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the one-year anniversary of the human rights crackdown in Cuba; H. Res. 576, Urging the Government of the People’s Republic of China to improve its protection of intellectual property rights; H. Con. Res. 326, Expressing the sense of Congress regarding the arbitrary detention of Dr. Wang Bingzhang by the Government of the People’s Republic of China and urging his immediate release; H. Con. Res. 336, Expressing the sense of Congress that the continued participation of the Russian Federation in the Group of 8 nations should be conditioned on the Russian Government voluntarily accepting and adhering to the norms and standards of democracy; H. Con. Res. 352, Recognizing the contributions of people of Indian origin to the United States and the benefits of working together with India towards promoting peace, prosperity, and freedom among all countries of the world; H. Con. Res. 378, Calling on the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam to immediately and unconditionally release Father Thaddeus Nguyen Van Ly; and a resolution expressing the concern of Congress over Iran’s development of the means to produce nuclear weapons, 10:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

March 31, Subcommittee on Europe, hearing on Belarus and Its future: Democracy or Soviet-Style Dictatorship? 1:30 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

April 1, Subcommittee on Africa, hearing on Fighting Terrorism in Africa, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

April 1, Subcommittee on International Terrorism, Nonproliferation and Human Rights, hearing on Al-Qaeda: The Threat to the United States and its Allies, 9:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, March 30, Subcommittee on the Constitution, oversight hearing on The Defense of Marriage Act, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

March 30, Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, hearing on S. 1743, Private Security Officer Employment Authorization Act of 2003, 1 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

March 31, Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security and Claims, hearing on H.R. 3191, to prescribe the oath of renunciation and allegiance for purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 2 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, March 30, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 3796, Abandoned Mine Lands Reclamation Reform Act of 2004; and H.R. 3778, Abandoned Mine Reclamation Program Extension and Reform Act of 2004, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

March 31, full Committee, oversight hearing on the Federal recognition and acknowledgment process by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

April 1, hearing on H.R. 898, Lumbee Recognition Act, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Rules, to consider H.R. 3966, ROTC and Military Recruiter Equal Access to Campus Act of 2004, 5 p.m., H-313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, March 30, Subcommittee on Research, hearing and markup of The Business of Math and Science: H.R. 4030, Congressional Medal for Outstanding Contributions in Math and Science Education Act, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

March 31, full Committee, to mark up the following measures: H.R. 3980, National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act of 2004; H.R. 3970, Green Chemistry Research and Development Act of 2004; and H.R. 4030, Congressional Medal for Outstanding Contributions in Math and Science Education Act of 2004, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

April 1, Subcommittee on Space, hearing on Lunar Science and Resources: Future Options, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, March 30, Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, oversight hearing on Inconsistent Regulation of Wetlands and Other Waters, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

March 31, Subcommittee on Railroads, hearing on the Status of Railroad Economic Regulation, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

April 1, Subcommittee on Aviation, oversight hearing on Airport Deregulation, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, March 30, Subcommittee on Health, hearing on the Department of Veterans Affairs providing certain veterans with a prescription-only health care benefit, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

March 31, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on current Department of Veterans Affairs employment practices with regard to procedures for background checks and credentialing, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

April 1, Subcommittee on Benefits, oversight hearing to receive the report of the VA Vocational Rehabilitation and Employment Service Task Force, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, March 30, Subcommittee on Oversight, hearing on 2004 Tax Return Filing Season and the IRS Budget for Fiscal Year 2005, 3 p.m., 1100 Longworth.

April 1, Subcommittee on Health, hearing on The Medicare Discount Drug Card, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, March 30, executive, hearing on Counterterrorism Budget, 2 p.m., H-405 Capitol.

March 30, Subcommittee on Terrorism and Homeland Security, executive, hearing on Nuclear, Biological, Chemical, Radiological Threats to the Homeland, 11 a.m., H-405 Capitol.

March 31, full Committee, executive, briefing on Iraq Weapons of Mass Destruction Update, 9 a.m., and executive, hearing on Counterintelligence Budget, 2 p.m., H-405 Capitol.

April 1, executive, hearing on Counternarcotics Budget, 9 a.m., H-405 Capitol.

April 1, Subcommittee on Intelligence Policy and National Security, executive, hearing on Intelligence Community Language Capabilities, 1 p.m., H-405 Capitol.

April 2, full Committee, executive, hearing on Special Programs Budget, 9 a.m., H-405 Capitol.

Select Committee on Homeland Security, March 30, Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Science and Research and Development, hearing entitled "Homeland Cybersecurity and DHS Enterprise Architecture Budget Hearing for Fiscal Year 2005," 10 a.m., 2325 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

1 p.m., Monday, March 29

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12:30 p.m., Monday, March 29

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will begin consideration of H.R. 4, Welfare Reform Reauthorization.

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Baldwin, Tammy, Wisc., E454, E456
 Berry, Marion, Ark., E451
 Biggert, Judy, Ill., E459
 Brady, Kevin, Tex., E452
 Collins, Mac, Ga., E463
 Cramer, Robert E. (Bud), Jr., Ala., E459, E461
 Davis, Susan A., Calif., E457
 DeGette, Diana, Colo., E458
 Diaz-Balart, Lincoln, Fla., E457

Frank, Barney, Mass., E456
 Gerlach, Jim, Pa., E461
 Gibbons, Jim, Nev., E454
 Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E456
 Holt, Rush D., N.J., E453
 Hooley, Darlene, Ore., E459
 Johnson, Sam, Tex., E453
 Kanjorski, Paul E., Pa., E451
 Lantos, Tom, Calif., E451
 Levin, Sander M., Mich., E451, E458
 Lewis, Ron, Ky., E453

McDermott, Jim, Wash., E463
 Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E460, E462
 Murphy, Tim, Pa., E453
 Myrick, Sue Wilkins, N.C., E456
 Owens, Major R., N.Y., E452
 Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E460, E462
 Turner, Michael R., Ohio, E461
 Upton, Fred, Mich., E452
 Young, C.W. Bill, Fla., E458



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the *Congressional Record* is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through *GPO Access* at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at 202-512-1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or *GPO Access* can be directed to the *GPO Access* User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1-888-293-6498 (toll-free), 202-512-1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202-512-1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, \$252.00 for six months, \$503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, \$10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, \$21.00; greater than 400 pages, \$31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, \$146.00 per year, or purchased for \$3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250-7954, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.